arXiv:1303.5521v1 [math.AP] 22 Mar 2013

Non self-similar blow-up solutions to the heat equation with nonlinear boundary conditions

Junichi Harada

Abstract

This paper is concerned with finite blow-up solutions of the heat equation with nonlinear boundary conditions. It is known that a rate of blow-up solutions is the same as the self-similar rate for a Sobolev subcritical case. A goal of this paper is to construct a blow-up solution whose blow-up rate is different from the self-similar rate for a Sobolev supercritical case.

Keyword Type II blow-up; nonlinear boundary condition

1 Introduction

We study positive solutions of the heat equation with nonlinear boundary conditions:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u = \Delta u, & (x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n_+ \times (0,T), \\ \partial_\nu u = u^q, & (x,t) \in \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+ \times (0,T), \\ u(x,0) = u_0(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}^n_+, \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

where $\mathbb{R}^n_+ = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n; x_n > 0\}$, $\partial_\nu = -\partial/\partial x_n$, $q > 1$ and

$$u_0 \in C(\overline{\mathbb{R}^n_+}) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n_+), \qquad u_0(x) \geq 0.$$

It is well known that (1) admits a unique local classical solution $u(x,t) \in BC(\overline{\mathbb{R}^n_+} \times [0,\tau)) \cap C^{2,1}(\overline{\mathbb{R}^n_+} \times (0,\tau))$ for small $\tau > 0$, where $BC(\Omega) = C(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$. However by the presence of nonlinearity u^q on the boundary, a solution $u(x,t)$ may blow up in a finite time $T > 0$, namely

$$\limsup_{t \to T} \|u(t)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n_+)} = \infty.$$

In fact, a solution of (1) actually blows up in a finite time under some conditions on the initial data (e.g. [3], [5], [15]). In this paper, we are concerned with the asymptotic behavior of blow-up solutions of (1). Let $q_S = n/(n-2)$ if $n \geq 3$ and $q_S = \infty$ if $n = 1, 2$. For the case $1 < q < q_S$, it is known that a finite time blow-up solution $u(x,t)$ of (1) satisfies

$$\sup_{t \in (0,T)} (T-t)^{1/2(q-1)} \|u(t)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n_+)} < \infty, \tag{2}$$

where $T > 0$ is the blow-up time of $u(x,t)$ ([1], [21]). More precisely, let $x_0 \in \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+$ be the blow-up point of $u(x,t)$, then the asymptotic behavior of $u(x,t)$ is described by the backward self-similar blow-up solution ([2]):

$$\lim_{t \to T} \sup_{|z| < R(T-t)^{1/2}} \left| (T-t)^{1/2(q-1)} u(x_0 + z, t) - \chi\left(z_n/\sqrt{T-t} \right) \right| \tag{3}$$

for any $R > 0$, where $\chi(\xi)$ is a unique positive solution of

$$\begin{cases} \chi'' - \dfrac{\xi}{2}\chi' - \dfrac{\chi}{2(q-1)} = 0 & \text{for } \xi > 0, \\ \chi' = -\chi^q & \text{on } \xi = 0. \end{cases}$$

Following their works, more precise asymptotic behavior of blow-up solutions were studied in [10, 11]. In general, the estimate (2) is known to be important as the first step to study the asymptotic behavior of blow-up solutions. Once (2) is derived, one may obtain more precise asymptotic behavior such as (3). However it is not yet known whether (2) always holds for the case $q \geq q_S$. An aim of this paper is to show the existence of finite time blow-up solutions of (1) which does not satisfy (2) for some range of $q \geq q_S$. This kind of non self-similar blow-up phenomenon was already studied in various semilinear parabolic equations. Particularly, this paper is motivated by [13, 14]. In that paper, they studied finite time blow-up solutions of

$$u_t = \Delta u + u^p, \qquad (x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times (0,T). \tag{4}$$

There are vast papers devoting finite time blow-up solutions of (4) and their asymptotic behavior. Let

$$p_S = \begin{cases} \infty & \text{if } n = 1,2, \\ \dfrac{n+2}{n-2} & \text{if } n \geq 3, \end{cases} \qquad p_{JL} = \begin{cases} \infty & \text{if } n \leq 10, \\ \dfrac{(n-2)^2 - 4n + 8\sqrt{n-1}}{(n-2)(n-10)} & \text{if } n \geq 11. \end{cases}$$

As for the blow-up rate, it was shown in [9, 8] that if $1 < p < p_S$, every finite blow-up solution of (4) satisfies

$$\sup_{t\in(0,T)} (T-t)^{1/(p-1)} \|u(t)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} < \infty. \tag{5}$$

This estimate is corresponding to (2), which is called type I blow-up. However (5) does not hold in general for $p \geq p_S$. In fact, Herrero and Velázuquez ([13, 14]) constructed finite time blow-up solutions satisfying

$$\sup_{t\in(0,T)} (T-t)^{1/(p-1)} \|u(t)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} = \infty$$

for $q > q_{JL}$ (see also [17]). This blow-up is called type II. They also gave the exact blow-up rate for type II blow-up solutions constructed in that paper. Their method relies on the matched asymptotic expansion technique. However this technique includes a formal argument, it is justified by Brouwer's fixed point type theorem with tough pointwise a priori estimates. This technique is known to be a strong tool to study the non self-similar phenomena in semilinear parabolic equations.

In this paper, following their arguments, we will construct non self-similar blow-up solutions of (1) which does not satisfy (2).

Theorem 1.1. *Let q be JL-supercritical* (see Definition 3.1). *Then there exists a positive x_n-axial symmetric initial data $u_0(x) \in BC(\overline{\mathbb{R}^n_+})$ such that a solution $u(x,t)$ of (1) with the initial data $u_0(x)$ blows up in a finite time $T > 0$ and satisfies*

$$\sup_{t\in(0,T)} (T-t)^{1/2(q-1)} \|u(t)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n_+)} = \infty. \tag{6}$$

Remark 1.1. *As far as the author knows, this paper seems to be the first one which treats non self-similar blow-up solutions in a non radial setting. However we will see that our argument is reduced to a radial case in the matching process.*

Our idea of the proof is almost same as that of [14]. To study finite time blow-up solutions, we first introduce the self-similar variables as usual.

$$\varphi(y,s) = (T-t)^{1/2(q-1)} u\left((T-t)^{1/2} x, t\right), \qquad T - t = e^{-s}.$$

Then we will construct a solution which converges to the singular stationary solution $U_\infty(y)$ in the self-similar variables. Since $U_\infty(0) = \infty$, this solution gives the desired non self-similar blow-up solution satisfying $\|\varphi(s)\|_\infty \to \infty$ as $s \to \infty$, which is equivalent to (6). To do that, we linearize the rescaled equation around the singular stationary solution $U_\infty(y)$ and construct a solution which behaves as

$$\varphi(y,s) \sim U_\infty(y) + ce^{-\lambda_\ell s}\phi_\ell(y), \tag{7}$$

where $\phi_\ell(y)$ and λ_ℓ are the ℓ-th eigenfunction and the ℓ-th eigenvalue of the linearized operator. However since $U_\infty(0) = 0$ and $|\phi_\ell(0)| = \infty$, this does not give the desired blow-up solution. To overcome this difficulty, following the idea in [14], we assume a solution behaves a different way in an inner region $0 < |y| < R(s)$ and an outer region $|y| > R(s)$ ($R(s) \to 0$ as $s \to 0$). In fact, we will see that a solutions behaves as (7) in the outer region, however it is described in a different way in the inner region. In this argument, the matching process at $|y| = R(s)$ plays a crucial role. Finally we justify this formal argument by Brouwer's type fixed point theorem.

In a non radial setting, to obtain a large time decay estimate, we can not apply the method in [14]. Here we improve their argument by combining the L^2-decay of solutions and the L^∞-L^2 estimate for the linearized equation. Furthermore we provide the fundamental solution of the heat equation with a singular boundary condition and establish its upper and lower bound. This equation is strongly related the heat equation with an inverse-square potential.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we collect notations for convenience. In Section 3, we recall a singular stationary solution and regular stationary solutions. Furthermore we provide a definition of a JL-critical exponent. Section 4 is devoted to the study of linearized problem in the self-similar variables. Here the fundamental solution of the heat equation with a singular boundary condition and its Duhamel's principle are discussed. In Section 5, we introduce a suitable functional space and give fundamental properties of solutions for a later argument. Finally Section 6 - Section 8 provides a priori estimates to apply a fixed point theorem. This part is a key and the most heavy part in this paper. In Appendix, we collect fundamental properties of eigenfunctions of the linearized problem.

2 Notations

Definition 2.1. *A function $u(x)$ defined on $\mathbb{R}^n_+$ is called a x_n-axial symmetric function, if $u(x)$ is expressed by $u(x) = U(|x'|, x_n)$ for some function U defined on $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+$.*

Throughout this paper, solutions are always assumed to be x_n-axial symmetric functions. For x_n-axial symmetric functions, we use the polar coordinate:

$$r = \sqrt{|x'|^2 + x_n^2}, \qquad \theta = \arctan\left(\frac{|x'|}{x_n}\right).$$

Let $S^{n-1}_+ = \{\omega = (\omega', \cos\theta); \omega' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1},\ \theta \in [0, \pi/2),\ |\omega'|^2 + (\cos\theta)^2 = 1\}$ be a half unit sphere. A function $\xi(\omega)$ on S^{n-1}_+ is called a x_n-axial symmetric function if $\xi(\omega)$ depends only on θ. We denote by Δ_S the Laplace-Beltrami operator on S^{n-1}. Then the Laplace-Beltrami operator Δ_S is expressed in a local coordinate by

$$\Delta_S \xi = \big(\partial_{\theta\theta} + (n-2)(\cot\theta)\partial_\theta\big)\xi$$

for any x_n-axial symmetric function $\xi \in C^2(S^{n-1}_+)$. Furthermore the positive (negative) part of a function u is denoted by $u_+ = \max\{u, 0\}$ ($u_- = \max\{-u, 0\}$). From this definition, it is clear that $u = u_+ - u_-$. Throughout this paper, we use

$$m = 1/(q-1).$$

3 Preliminaries

3.1 Singular stationary solutions

First we introduce a singular solution of the following elliptic problem:

$$\Delta U = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n_+, \qquad \partial_\nu U = U^q \quad \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+. \tag{8}$$

We look for a singular solution which has a special form:

$$U_\infty(x) = V(\theta) r^{-1/(q-1)}.$$

Then $V(\theta)$ is a solution of

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_S V = m(n-2-m)V & \text{in } (0,\pi/2), \\ \partial_\theta V = V^q & \text{on } \{\pi/2\}. \end{cases} \tag{9}$$

Lemma 3.1 (Lemma 9 [20])**.** *For $q > (n-1)/(n-2)$, there exists a unique positive solution of* (9)*.*

Throughout this paper, we denote by $V(\theta)$ the unique solution of (9) and by $U_\infty(x) = V(\theta)r^{-1/(q-1)}$ a singular solution of (8). Furthermore for simplicity of notations, we put

$$\mathcal{K} = qV|^{q-1}_{\theta=\pi/2}.$$

3.2 JL-critical exponent

To define a JL-critical exponent, we first introduce the trace Hardy inequality.

Lemma 3.2 (Theorem 1.4 [4])**.** *Let $n \geq 3$. We define*

$$c_H = \inf_{u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n_+)} \frac{\displaystyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} |\nabla u|^2 dx}{\displaystyle\int_{\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+} |x'|^{-1}|u|^2 dx'}.$$

Then c_H is given by $c_H = 2\Gamma\left(n/4\right)^2 \Gamma\left((n-2)/4\right)^{-2}$.

From Lemma 3.2, we can define

$$\mu(q) = \inf_{u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n_+)} \frac{\displaystyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} |\nabla u|^2 dx - \mathcal{K}\int_{\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+} r^{-1}u^2 dx'}{\displaystyle\int_{\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+} |x'|^{-1}u^2 dx'}.$$

This expression is obtained by linearizing the equation around the singular stationary solution $U_\infty(x)$.

Definition 3.1. *A exponent q is called JL-supercritcal if $\mu(q) > 0$, JL-critical if $\mu(q) = 0$ and JL-subcritical if $\mu(q) < 0$.*

Remark 3.1. *By the explicit expression of $U_\infty(x) = V(\theta)r^{-1/(q-1)}$ and Lemma 3.2, we see that $\mu(q) > 0$ is equivalent to $\mathcal{K} < c_H$. Hence an exponent q is JL-supercritcal if $\mathcal{K} < c_H$, JL-critical if $\mathcal{K} = c_H$ and JL-subcritical if $\mathcal{K} > c_H$.*

Unfortunately we do not know the explicit expression of a JL-critical exponent. However we find that q is JL-subcritical if q is close to $n/(n-2)$ and q is JL-supercritical if q and n are large enough.

Lemma 3.3 (Lemma 4.1 - Lemma 4.2 in [12])**.** *For $n \geq 3$ there exists $q_0 > n/(n-2)$ such that $\mu(q) < 0$ if $n/(n-2) < q < q_0$. Moreover there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for $n \geq n_0$ there exists $q_1 > q_0$ such that $\mu(q) > 0$ if $q > q_1$.*

3.3 Regular stationary solutions

In this subsection, we collect the qualitative property of positive x_n-axial symmetric solutions of (8) obtained in [12]. Let κ_i, $e_i(\theta)$ be the i-th eigenvalue, the i-th eigenfunction with $\|e_i\|_{L^2(S_+^{n-1})} = 1$ of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_S e = \kappa e & \text{in } (0,\pi/2), \\ \partial_\theta e = \mathcal{K} e & \text{on } \{\pi/2\}. \end{cases} \tag{10}$$

Then from Lemma 6.8 - Lemma 6.10 in [12], the first and the second eigenvalues are estimated as follows.

Lemma 3.4. *The first eigenvalue κ_1 is estimated as follows:*

$$\begin{aligned} &\kappa_1 > -(n-2)^2/4 \quad \text{if } q \text{ is JL-supercritical}, \\ &\kappa_1 = -(n-2)^2/4 \quad \text{if } q \text{ is JL-critical}, \\ &\kappa_1 < -(n-2)^2/4 \quad \text{if } q \text{ is JL-subcritical}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover the second eigenvalue κ_2 is always positive.

From Lemma 3.4, it is easily seen that

$$\mu^2 - (n-2-2m)\mu - \{m(n-2-m) + \kappa_1\} = 0$$

has two real roots if and only if q is JL-supercritical. We denote the small positive root by μ_1, which is written by

$$\mu_1 = \frac{(n-2-2m) - \sqrt{(n-2-2m)^2 + 4\{m(n-2-m) + \kappa_1\}}}{2}. \tag{11}$$

Theorem 3.1 (Theorem 1.1 [12])**.** *Let q be JL-supercritical or JL-critical. Then there exists a family of positive x_n-axial symmetric solutions $\{U_\alpha(x)\}_{\alpha>0}$ ($U_\alpha(0) = \alpha$) of (8) satisfying the following properties.*

(i) $U_\alpha(x) = \alpha U_1(\alpha^{q-1}x) \leq U_\infty(x)$, (ii) $U_{\alpha_1}(x) < U_{\alpha_2}(x)$ *if* $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$,

(iii) $\lim_{\alpha\to\infty} U_\alpha(x) = U_\infty(x)$ for $x \in \overline{\mathbb{R}^n_+} \setminus \{0\}$,

(iv) *there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that for any $\alpha > 0$ there exist $k_\alpha = \alpha^{-\mu_1/m}k_1 > 0$ and $k'_\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ such that the following asymptotic expansion holds for large $r > 0$*

$$U_\alpha(x) = U_\infty(x) + \begin{cases} (-k_\alpha + O(r^{-\epsilon}))e_1(\theta)r^{-(m+\mu_1)} & \text{if JL-supercritical}, \\ (-k_\alpha \log r + k'_\alpha + o(r^{-\epsilon}))e_1(\theta)r^{-(n-2)/2} & \text{if JL-critical}, \end{cases}$$

where the polar coordinate $r = |x|$, $\tan\theta = |x'|/x_n$ is used and the asymptotic expansion holds uniformly for $\theta \in (0,\pi/2)$.

4 Linearized problems around the singular solution

To study blow-up solutions, we introduce self-similar variables and a rescaled solution:

$$\varphi(y,s) = (T-t)^{1/2(q-1)}u((T-t)^{1/2}y,t), \qquad T-t = e^{-s}.$$

Put $s_T = -\log T$. Then $\varphi(y,s)$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \varphi_s = \Delta\varphi - \dfrac{y}{2}\cdot\nabla\varphi - \dfrac{m}{2}\varphi, & (y,s) \in \mathbb{R}^n_+ \times (s_T,\infty), \\ \partial_\nu\varphi = \varphi^q, & (y,s) \in \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+ \times (s_T,\infty). \end{cases} \tag{12}$$

Here we put

$$\Phi(y,s) = \varphi(y,s) - U_\infty(y).$$

Then since $qU_\infty(x)^{q-1}|_{\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+} = \mathcal{K}r^{-1}$, it is easily seen that $\Phi(y,s)$ solves

$$\begin{cases} \Phi_s = \Delta\Phi - \dfrac{y}{2}\cdot\nabla\Phi - \dfrac{m}{2}\Phi, & (y,s)\in\mathbb{R}^n_+\times(s_T,\infty), \\ \partial_\nu\Phi = \mathcal{K}r^{-1}\Phi + f(\Phi), & (y,s)\in\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+\times(s_T,\infty), \end{cases} \tag{13}$$

where

$$f(\Phi) = (\Phi + U_\infty)^q - U_\infty^q - \mathcal{K}\Phi.$$

Now we define weighted Lebesgue spaces and Sobolev spaces:

$$L^p_\rho = \left\{ v\in L^p_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n_+);\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} |v(y)|^p\rho(y)dy < \infty \right\},$$

$$H^k_\rho = \left\{ v\in L^2_\rho; D^\alpha v\in L^2_\rho \text{ for any } \alpha = (\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_n) \text{ satisfying } |\alpha|\le k \right\},$$

$$L^p_\rho(\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+) = \left\{ v\in L^p_{\mathrm{loc}}(\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+);\ \int_{\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+} |v(y')|^p\rho(y')dy' < \infty \right\},$$

where a wight function $\rho(y)$ is given by

$$\rho(y) = e^{-|y|^2/4}.$$

The norms are given by

$$\|v\|^p_{L^p_\rho} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} |v(y)|^p\rho(y)dy, \qquad \|v\|^2_{H^k_\rho} = \sum_{|\alpha|\le k}\|D^\alpha v\|^2_{L^2_\rho},$$

$$\|v\|^p_{L^p_\rho(\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+)} = \int_{\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+} |v(y')|^p\rho(y')dy'$$

and the inner product on L^2_ρ is naturally defined by

$$(v_1,v_2)_\rho = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} v_1(y)v_2(y)\rho(y)dy.$$

For simplicity, we set

$$\|\cdot\|_\rho = \|\cdot\|_{L^2_\rho}.$$

Let H^*_ρ be the dual space of H^1_ρ. To study the asymptotic behavior of $\Phi(y,s)$, we define a linear operator A: $D(A)\to H^*_\rho$ with $D(A) = H^1_\rho$ by

$${}_{H^*_\rho}\langle A\Phi,\eta\rangle_{H^1_\rho} = -(\nabla\Phi,\nabla\eta)_\rho - \frac{m}{2}(\Phi,\eta)_\rho + \mathcal{K}\int_{\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+} r^{-1}\Phi\eta\rho\, dy'.$$

Lemma 4.1. *Let q be JL-supercritical. Then an operator $(-A+\mu)\colon D(A)\to H^*_\rho$ has compact inverse on L^2_ρ for large $\mu>0$. Moreover its inverse is self-adjoint on L^2_ρ.*

Proof. First we claim that there exist $\alpha_0,\mu>0$ such that

$$((-A+\mu)\Phi,\Phi)_\rho \ge \alpha_0\left(\|\nabla\Phi\|^2_\rho + \|\Phi\|^2_\rho\right) \qquad \text{for } \Phi\in D(A). \tag{14}$$

Let θ be a cut off function such that $\theta(|y|) = 1$ for $|y| < 1$ and $\theta(|y|) = 0$ for $|y| > 2$. Then by the trace Hardy inequality, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
c_H \int_{\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+} r^{-1}\theta^2\Phi^2\rho\, dy' &\le \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} |\nabla(\theta\Phi\rho^{1/2})|^2 dy \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} \left(\theta^2|\nabla\Phi|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\nabla\Phi^2\cdot\nabla\theta^2 - \frac{y}{4}\cdot\nabla(\theta\Phi)^2 + \left(\frac{|y|^2}{16}\theta^2 + |\nabla\theta|^2\right)\Phi^2\right)\rho\, dy \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} \left(\theta^2|\nabla\Phi|^2 - \frac{1}{2}\Phi^2\Delta\theta^2 + \frac{n}{4}\theta^2\Phi^2 + \left(\frac{|y|^2}{16}\theta^2 + |\nabla\theta|^2\right)\Phi^2\right)\rho\, dy \\
&\le \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} |\nabla\Phi|^2\rho\, dy + c_0\int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} \Phi^2\rho\, dy.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore we obtain

$$(-A\Phi,\Phi)_\rho \ge \left(1 - \frac{\mathcal{K}}{c_H}\right)\|\nabla\Phi\|_\rho^2 - c_0\|\Phi\|_\rho - \mathcal{K}\int_{\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+} r^{-1}(1-\theta^2)\Phi^2\rho\, dy'.$$

Since $\mathcal{K} < c_H$, by using $\int_{\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+}\Phi^2\rho dy' \le \epsilon\int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+}|\nabla\Phi|^2\rho dy + c_1\epsilon^{-1}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+}\Phi^2\rho dy$ (see Lemma 3.1 in [11]), we can assure (14). Therefore the operator $(-A+\mu)$ has inverse from L^2_ρ to H^1_ρ. Furthermore its inverse is clearly self-adjoint on L^2_ρ. Finally we prove that $(-A+\mu)^{-1}$ is compact on L^2_ρ. Let $f \in L^2_\rho$ and $\Phi = (-A+\mu)^{-1}f$. Then it holds from (14) that

$$\|\nabla\Phi\|_\rho^2 + \|\Phi\|_\rho^2 \le \frac{4}{\alpha_0^2}\|f\|_\rho^2.$$

We recall that the embedding $H^1_\rho \to L^2_\rho$ is compact (see Lemma A.2 in [11]). Therefore the proof is completed. $\square$

From Lemma 4.1, we find that L^2_ρ is spanned by eigenfunctions of

$$\begin{cases} -\left(\Delta - \dfrac{y}{2}\cdot\nabla - \dfrac{m}{2}\right)\phi = \lambda\phi & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n_+, \\ \partial_\nu\phi = \mathcal{K}r^{-1}\phi & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+. \end{cases} \tag{15}$$

Since solutions are assumed to be y_n-axial symmetric, every eigenfunction of (15) is given by the following separation of variables:

$$\phi(y) = e(\theta)a(r).$$

Let $e_i(\theta)$ and κ_i be the i-th eigenfunction with $\|e_i\|_{L^2(S^{n-1}_+)} = 1$ and the i-th eigenvalue of (10). Moreover let $a_{ij}(r)$ and λ_{ij} be the j-th eigenfunction with $\int_0^\infty a_{ij}(r)^2\rho r^{n-1}dr = 1$ and the j-th eigenvalue of

$$-\left(a'' + \frac{n-1}{r}a' - \frac{\kappa_i}{r^2}a' - \frac{r}{2}a' - \frac{m}{2}a\right) = \lambda a, \qquad r > 0.$$

Then all eigenfunctions are expressed by

$$\phi_{ij}(y) = e_i(\theta)a_{ij}(r)$$

and its eigenvalue is given by λ_{ij}. The detail is stated in Appendix.

4.1 Heat kernel and representation formula

In this subsection, we provide fundamental estimates of the following linear parabolic equations related to (13) and give a representation formula (the Duhamel principle).

$$\begin{cases} \Phi_s = \Delta\Phi - \dfrac{y}{2}\cdot\nabla\Phi - \dfrac{m}{2}\Phi, & (y,s)\in\mathbb{R}^n_+\times(0,\infty), \\ \partial_\nu\Phi = \mathcal{K}r^{-1}\Phi, & (y,s)\in\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+\times(0,\infty), \\ \Phi(y,0)=\Phi_0(y), & y\in\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+. \end{cases}$$

Let μ_1 be given in (11) and $e_1(\theta)$ be the first eigenfunction of (10). We set

$$\sigma(y) = r^{-\gamma}e_1(\theta), \qquad \gamma = m+\mu_1.$$

Then it is easily verified that

$$m<\gamma<\frac{n-2}{2}.$$

Furthermore we find that $\sigma(y)$ solves

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta\sigma = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n_+, \\ \partial_\nu\sigma = \mathcal{K}r^{-1}\sigma & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+. \end{cases} \tag{16}$$

Now we introduce a new function $b(y,s)$ by

$$b(y,s) = \Phi(y,s)/\sigma(y).$$

Then $b(y,s)$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} b_s = \Delta b - \dfrac{y}{2}\cdot\nabla b + \dfrac{2\nabla\sigma}{\sigma}\cdot\nabla b + \left(\dfrac{\gamma-m}{2}\right)b, & (y,s)\in\mathbb{R}^n_+\times(0,\infty), \\ \partial_\nu b = 0, & (y,s)\in\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+\times(0,\infty), \\ b(y,0)=b_0(y):=\Phi_0(y)/\sigma(y), & y\in\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+. \end{cases} \tag{17}$$

To show the existence of the heat kernel of (17), we go back to the original variables (x,t).

$$z(x,t) = (1-t)^{(\gamma-m)/2}b((1-t)^{-1/2}x, -\log(1-t)).$$

Now we put

$$\mathcal{B}(x) = \sigma(x)^2.$$

Then since $\sigma(y)$ satisfies (16), it is easily seen that $z(x,t)$ solves

$$\begin{cases} z_t = \dfrac{1}{\mathcal{B}}\operatorname{div}(\mathcal{B}\nabla z), & (x,s)\in\mathbb{R}^n_+\times(0,\infty), \\ \partial_\nu z = 0, & (x,s)\in\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+\times(0,\infty), \\ z(x,0)=z_0(x):=b_0(x), & x\in\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+. \end{cases} \tag{18}$$

This equation is also written in another form.

$$z_t = \frac{1}{\mathcal{B}}\operatorname{div}(\mathcal{B}\nabla z) = \Delta z + \left(\frac{2\nabla\sigma}{\sigma}\right)\cdot\nabla z.$$

Here we introduce other weighted Lebesgue spaces related to (18).

$$L^p_{\mathcal{B}} = \left\{ z\in L^p_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n_+);\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+}|z(x)|^p\mathcal{B}(x)dx<\infty \right\}, \qquad H^1_{\mathcal{B}} = \{z\in L^2_{\mathcal{B}};\nabla z\in L^2_{\mathcal{B}}\}.$$

Inner products on $L^2_{\mathcal{B}}$ and $H^1_{\mathcal{B}}$ are defined by

$$(z_1, z_2)_{\mathcal{B}} := \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} z_1(x) z_2(x) \mathcal{B}(x) dx,$$

$$(z_1, z_2)_{H^1_{\mathcal{B}}} := (\nabla z_1, \nabla z_2)_{\mathcal{B}} + (z_1, z_2)_{\mathcal{B}}.$$

For simplicity, we write $\| \cdot \|_{\mathcal{B}} = \| \cdot \|_{L^2_{\mathcal{B}}}$. Furthermore we denote by $H^*_{\mathcal{B}}$ be the dual space of $H^1_{\mathcal{B}}$. Let J: $H^1_{\mathcal{B}} \to H^*_{\mathcal{B}}$ be a mapping defined by ${}_{H^*_{\mathcal{B}}}\langle Jz, \zeta \rangle_{H^1_{\mathcal{B}}} = (z, \zeta)_{H^1_{\mathcal{B}}}$ for all $\zeta \in H^1_{\mathcal{B}}$. Then an inner product of $H^*_{\mathcal{B}}$ is defined by

$$(z_1, z_2)_{H^*_{\mathcal{B}}} := (J^{-1} z_1, J^{-1} z_2)_{H^1_{\mathcal{B}}}, \quad \forall z_1, z_2 \in H^*_{\mathcal{B}}.$$

In the usual manner, $z \in L^2_{\mathcal{B}}$ can be considered as an element of $H^*_{\mathcal{B}}$.

$${}_{H^*_{\mathcal{B}}}\langle z, \zeta \rangle_{H^1_{\mathcal{B}}} := (z, \zeta)_{\mathcal{B}}, \quad \forall \zeta \in H^1_{\mathcal{B}}.$$

We define a linear operator A_0: $H^1_{\mathcal{B}} \to H^*_{\mathcal{B}}$ by

$${}_{H^*_{\mathcal{B}}}\langle A_0 z, \zeta \rangle_{H^1_{\mathcal{B}}} := -(\nabla z, \nabla \zeta)_{\mathcal{B}}, \quad \forall \zeta \in H^1_{\mathcal{B}}.$$

Then a weak solution of (18) is defined by

$$\begin{cases} {}_{H^*_{\mathcal{B}}}\langle z_t(t), \zeta \rangle_{H^1_{\mathcal{B}}} = {}_{H^*_{\mathcal{B}}}\langle A_0 z(t), \zeta \rangle_{H^1_{\mathcal{B}}} = -(\nabla z(t), \nabla \zeta)_{\mathcal{B}}, \quad \forall \zeta \in H^1_{\mathcal{B}}, \\ z(0) = z_0. \end{cases} \tag{19}$$

Since ${}_{H^*_{\mathcal{B}}}\langle -A_0 z, z \rangle_{H^1_{\mathcal{B}}} = -\|\nabla z\|^2_{\mathcal{B}}$ for all $z \in H^1_{\mathcal{B}}$, it is easily verified that the operator A_0 with $D(A_0) = H^1_{\mathcal{B}}$ is self-adjoint on $H^*_{\mathcal{B}}$. Therefore we obtain the following results.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $z_0 \in H^*_{\mathcal{B}}$. Then there exists a unique weak solution of* (19) *satisfying*

$$z \in C([0, \infty); H^*_{\mathcal{B}}) \cap C^1((0, \infty); H^*_{\mathcal{B}}) \cap C((0, \infty); H^1_{\mathcal{B}}).$$

In particular, $g(t) = \|z(t)\|^2_{\mathcal{B}}$ is absolutely continuous on $(0, \infty)$ and $g'(t) = -2\|\nabla z(t)\|^2_{\mathcal{B}}$ for a.e. $t \in (0, \infty)$. Moreover if $z_0 \in H^1_{\mathcal{B}}$, then the solution z is in $C([0, \infty); H_{\mathcal{B}})$.

Next we provide estimates of time derivatives of solutions constructed in Lemma 4.2.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $z_0 \in L^2_{\mathcal{B}}$. Then there exists a unique weak solution of* (19) *satisfying*

$$z \in C([0, \infty); L^2_{\mathcal{B}}) \cap C^1((0, \infty); L^2_{\mathcal{B}}) \cap C((0, \infty); H^1_{\mathcal{B}}),$$
$$t\|z_t(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}} + \sqrt{t}\|\nabla z(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}} \le c\|z_0\|_{\mathcal{B}}.$$

Furthermore if $z_0 \in L^1_{\mathcal{B}} \cap L^2_{\mathcal{B}}$, then it holds that

$$z \in C([0, \infty); L^1_{\mathcal{B}}), \qquad \|z(t)\|_{L^1_{\mathcal{B}}} = \|z_0\|_{L^1_{\mathcal{B}}}, \quad \forall t > 0.$$

Proof. To obtain solutions satisfying the desired regularity, we consider approximation problems. Let $\theta(|x|)$ be a smooth cut off function such that $\theta(r) = 0$ for $r \in (0, 1/4)$ and $\theta(r) = 1$ for $r > 3/4$, and set $\theta_\epsilon(|x|) = \theta(|x|/\epsilon)$. Now we define $\mathcal{B}_\epsilon(x)$ and $\sigma_\epsilon(x)$ by

$$\sigma_\epsilon(x) = \theta_\epsilon \sigma(x) + (1 - \theta_\epsilon)\epsilon^{-\gamma}, \qquad \mathcal{B}_\epsilon(x) = \sigma_\epsilon(x)^2.$$

Then there exist $c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4 > 0$ such that for $0 < |x| < \epsilon$

$$c_1 \epsilon^{-\gamma} < \sigma_\epsilon(x) < c_2 \epsilon^{-\gamma}, \qquad |\nabla \sigma_\epsilon(x)| < c_3 \epsilon^{-\gamma-1}, \qquad |D^2 \sigma_\epsilon(x)| < c_4 \epsilon^{-\gamma-2}.$$

Therefore there exists $c > 0$ such that for $0 < |x| < \epsilon$

$$\frac{|\nabla \sigma_\epsilon(x)|}{\sigma_\epsilon(x)} < c|x|^{-1}, \qquad \frac{|D^2\sigma_\epsilon(x)|}{\sigma_\epsilon(x)} < c|x|^{-2}. \tag{20}$$

Now we consider the following approximation equation.

$$\begin{cases} z_t = \dfrac{1}{\mathcal{B}_\epsilon}\operatorname{div}\left(\mathcal{B}_\epsilon \nabla z\right), & (x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n_+ \times (0,\infty), \\ \partial_\nu z = 0 & (x,t) \in \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+ \times (0,\infty), \\ z(x,0) = z_0(x), & x \in \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+. \end{cases} \tag{21}$$

First we assume that

$$z_0 \in C_c^\infty(\overline{\mathbb{R}^n_+}), \qquad \partial_\nu z_0 = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+. \tag{22}$$

Then since a right-hand side of (21) is written by

$$\frac{1}{\mathcal{B}_\epsilon}\operatorname{div}\left(\mathcal{B}_\epsilon \nabla z\right) = \Delta z + \frac{2\nabla\sigma_\epsilon}{\sigma_\epsilon} \cdot \nabla z$$

and $\nabla\sigma_\epsilon/\sigma_\epsilon$ is smooth, if z_0 satisfies (22), there exists a unique solution $z_\epsilon(x,t)$ such that $z_\epsilon(x,t) \in C^{2,1}(\overline{\mathbb{R}^n_+} \times [0,\infty)) \cap C^\infty(\overline{\mathbb{R}^n_+} \times (0,\infty))$ and

$$z_\epsilon(t) \in C^1([0,\infty); L^2_{\mathcal{B}_\epsilon}), \qquad z_\epsilon(t) \in C^k((0,\infty); H^1_{\mathcal{B}_\epsilon}) \quad (k \geq 1),$$

where $L^2_{\mathcal{B}_\epsilon}$ and $H^1_{\mathcal{B}_\epsilon}$ are defined in the same manner as $L^2_{\mathcal{B}}$ and $H^1_{\mathcal{B}}$. By a maximum principle, it is easily seen that

$$\|z_\epsilon(t)\|_\infty \leq \|z_0\|_\infty, \quad t > 0. \tag{23}$$

Put $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{B}_\epsilon} = \|\cdot\|_{L^2_{\mathcal{B}_\epsilon}}$. Then multiplying (21) by $z_\epsilon\sigma_\epsilon^2$, $\partial_t z_\epsilon\sigma_\epsilon^2$, $t\partial_t z_\epsilon\sigma_\epsilon^2$ and integrating over $\mathbb{R}^n_+ \times (0,t)$ respectively, we get

$$\begin{gathered} \frac{1}{2}\|z_\epsilon(t)\|^2_{\mathcal{B}_\epsilon} + \int_0^t \|\nabla z_\epsilon(\tau)\|^2_{\mathcal{B}_\epsilon} d\tau = \frac{1}{2}\|z_0\|^2_{\mathcal{B}_\epsilon}, \\ \int_0^t \|\partial_t z_\epsilon(\tau)\|^2_{\mathcal{B}_\epsilon} d\tau + \frac{1}{2}\|\nabla z_\epsilon(t)\|^2_{\mathcal{B}_\epsilon} = \frac{1}{2}\|\nabla z_0\|^2_{\mathcal{B}_\epsilon} d\tau, \\ \int_0^t \tau\|\partial_t z_\epsilon(\tau)\|^2_{\mathcal{B}_\epsilon} d\tau + \frac{t}{2}\|\nabla z_\epsilon(t)\|^2_{\mathcal{B}_\epsilon} = \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t \|\nabla z_\epsilon(\tau)\|^2_{\mathcal{B}_\epsilon} d\tau. \end{gathered} \tag{24}$$

To obtain a priori estimates for higher derivatives, we differentiate (21) with respect to t, then $Z_\epsilon(x,t) := \partial_t z_\epsilon(x,t)$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} Z_t = \dfrac{1}{\mathcal{B}_\epsilon}\operatorname{div}\left(\mathcal{B}_\epsilon \nabla Z\right), & (x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n_+ \times (0,\infty), \\ \partial_\nu Z = 0, & (x,t) \in \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+ \times (0,\infty). \end{cases} \tag{25}$$

Since $Z_\epsilon(x,t) \in C(\overline{\mathbb{R}^n_+} \times [0,\infty))$, by a maximum principle, we get

$$\|\partial_t z_\epsilon(t)\|_\infty = \|Z_\epsilon(t)\|_\infty \leq \|Z_\epsilon(0)\|_\infty \leq \left\|\Delta z_0 + \frac{2\nabla\sigma_\epsilon}{\sigma_\epsilon} \cdot \nabla z_0\right\|_\infty. \tag{26}$$

Multiplying (25) by $t^2 Z_\epsilon\sigma_\epsilon^2$, $t^3\partial_t Z_\epsilon\sigma_\epsilon^2$ respectively and integrating over $\mathbb{R}^n_+ \times (0,t)$, we get

$$\begin{gathered} \frac{t^2}{2}\|Z_\epsilon(t)\|^2_{\mathcal{B}_\epsilon} + \int_0^t \tau^2\|\nabla Z_\epsilon(\tau)\|^2_{\mathcal{B}_\epsilon} d\tau = \int_0^t \tau\|Z_\epsilon(\tau)\|^2_{\mathcal{B}_\epsilon} d\tau, \\ \int_0^t \tau^3\|\partial_t Z_\epsilon(\tau)\|^2_{\mathcal{B}_\epsilon} d\tau + \frac{t^3}{2}\|\nabla Z_\epsilon(t)\|^2_{\mathcal{B}_\epsilon} = \frac{3}{2}\int_0^t \tau^2\|\nabla Z_\epsilon(\tau)\|^2_{\mathcal{B}_\epsilon} d\tau. \end{gathered} \tag{27}$$

Therefore since $\sigma_\epsilon(x) \le c\sigma(x)$ for some $c > 0$, we obtain from (24) and (27)

$$t^2\|Z_\epsilon(t)\|^2_{\mathcal{B}_\epsilon} \le \|z_0\|^2_{\mathcal{B}_\epsilon} \le c\|z_0\|^2_{\mathcal{B}},$$
$$\int_0^t \left(\tau^3\|\partial_t Z_\epsilon(\tau)\|^2_{\sigma_\epsilon^2} + \tau^2\|\nabla Z_\epsilon(\tau)\|^2_{\sigma_\epsilon^2} + \tau\|Z_\epsilon(\tau)\|^2_{\sigma_\epsilon^2}\right) \le c\|z_0\|^2_{\mathcal{B}}.$$

As a consequence, since $\sigma_\epsilon(x) = \sigma(x)$ for $|x| > \epsilon$, it holds that for $t > \delta$

$$\int_\delta^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+ \setminus B_\epsilon} \left(\delta^3|\partial_t Z_\epsilon(x,t)|^2 + \delta^2|\nabla Z_\epsilon(x,t)|^2 + \delta|Z_\epsilon(x,t)|^2\right) \mathcal{B}(x)dx \le c\|z_0\|^2_{\mathcal{B}}.$$

Therefore by a compact embedding, there exist a subsequence $\{Z_{\epsilon_k}(x,t)\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \{Z_\epsilon(x,t)\}_{\epsilon>0}$ and a limiting function $Z(x,t) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_+ \setminus B_r \times (\delta, \delta^{-1}))$ for any $r, \delta \in (0,1)$ such that for any $\nu > 0$ and $r_1, \delta_1 \in (0,1)$, there exists $k_1(\nu, r_1, \delta_1) > 0$ such that for $k > k_1$

$$\int_{\delta_1}^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+ \setminus B_{r_1}} |Z_{\epsilon_k}(x,t) - Z(x,t)|^2 \mathcal{B}(x)dx \le \nu.$$

As a consequence, by using (26), we get for $k, k' > k_1$

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\delta_1}^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} |Z_{\epsilon_k}(x,t) - Z_{\epsilon_{k'}}(x,t)|^2 \mathcal{B}(x)dx &\le \nu + 2 \sup_{\epsilon\in(0,1)} \sup_{\tau\in(0,t)} \|Z_\epsilon(\tau)\|^2_\infty \int_{\delta_1}^t \int_{B_{r_1}} \mathcal{B}(x)dx \\ &\le \nu + 2t \left\|\Delta z_0 + \frac{2\nabla\sigma_\epsilon}{\sigma_\epsilon}\cdot\nabla z_0\right\|_\infty \int_{B_{r_1}} \mathcal{B}(x)dx.\end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$Z_{\epsilon_k} \to Z \quad \text{in } L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_+ \times (\delta, \delta^{-1})) \tag{28}$$

for any $\delta \in (0,1)$. Let $\theta_\mu(x)$ be a smooth cut off function satisfying

$$\theta_\mu(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |x| < \mu, \\ 1 & \text{if } |x| > 2\mu, \end{cases} \qquad 0 \le \theta_\mu(x) \le 1, \qquad |\nabla\theta_\mu(x)| < c/\mu.$$

Since $\sigma_\epsilon(x) = \sigma(x)$ for $|x| > \epsilon$, multiplying (25) by $(t-\delta)(Z_\epsilon(x,t) - Z_{\epsilon'}(x,t))\theta_r(x)^2\sigma(x)^2$ and integrating over $\mathbb{R}^n_+ \times (\delta, t)$, then we get for $t > \delta > 0$ and $\epsilon', \epsilon < r$

$$\begin{aligned}(t-\delta)&\int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} (Z_\epsilon(x,t) - Z_{\epsilon'}(x,t))^2 \theta_r(x)^2\mathcal{B}(x)dx \\ &\le \int_\delta^t d\tau \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} |(Z_\epsilon(x,\tau) - Z_{\epsilon'}(x,\tau))|^2 \mathcal{B}(x)dx \\ &\quad + cr^{-2}\int_\delta^t (\tau-\delta)d\tau \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} |(Z_\epsilon(x,\tau) - Z_{\epsilon'}(x,\tau))|^2 \mathcal{B}(x)dx.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore by virtue of (28), we find

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+ \setminus B_r} |Z_{\epsilon_k}(x,t) - Z(x,t)|^2 \mathcal{B}(x)dx = 0 \quad \text{uniformly for } t \in (\delta, \delta^{-1})$$

with any fixed $r > 0$ and $\delta \in (0,1)$. As a consequence, from (26), we obtain

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} |Z_{\epsilon_k}(x,t) - Z(x,t)|^2 \mathcal{B}(x)dx = 0 \quad \text{uniformly for } t \in (\delta, \delta^{-1})$$

with any fixed $\delta \in (0,1)$. Next we provide estimates of $\nabla z_\epsilon(x,t)$. Since $\sigma_\epsilon(x) = \sigma(x)$ for $|x| > \epsilon$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} |\nabla z_\epsilon(x,t)|^2 \mathcal{B}(x) dx &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} z_\epsilon(x,t) \nabla\big(\mathcal{B}(x)\nabla z_\epsilon(x,t)\big) dx \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+ \setminus B_\epsilon} z_\epsilon(x,t)\nabla\big(\mathcal{B}_\epsilon(x)\nabla z_\epsilon(x,t)\big)dx + \int_{B_\epsilon} z_\epsilon(x,t)\nabla\big(\mathcal{B}(x)\nabla z_\epsilon(x,t)\big)dx \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+ \setminus B_\epsilon} z_\epsilon(x,t)\partial_t z_\epsilon(x,t)\mathcal{B}_\epsilon(x)dx + \int_{B_\epsilon} z_\epsilon(x,t)\nabla\big(\mathcal{B}(x)\nabla z_\epsilon(x,t)\big)dx \\
&\le \|z_\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}} \|\partial_t z_\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}} + I_\epsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $z_\epsilon(x,t)$ is a solution of (21), by virtue of (20), I_ϵ is estimated as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
I_\epsilon &= \int_{B_\epsilon} z_\epsilon(x,t)\left(\Delta z_\epsilon(x,t) + \frac{2\nabla\sigma}{\sigma}\cdot\nabla z_\epsilon(x,t)\right)\mathcal{B}(x)dx \\
&= \int_{B_\epsilon} z_\epsilon(x,t)\left(\partial_t z_\epsilon(x,t) - \frac{2\nabla\sigma_\epsilon}{\sigma_\epsilon}\cdot\nabla z_\epsilon(x,t) + \frac{2\nabla\sigma}{\sigma}\cdot\nabla z_\epsilon(x,t)\right)\mathcal{B}(x)dx \\
&= (z_\epsilon(t), \partial_t z_\epsilon(t))_{\mathcal{B}} - \int_{\partial B_\epsilon} z_\epsilon(x,t)^2\left(\frac{\partial_\nu\sigma_\epsilon}{\sigma_\epsilon} - \frac{\partial_\nu\sigma}{\sigma}\right)\mathcal{B}(x)dx \\
&\qquad\qquad + \int_{B_\epsilon} z_\epsilon(x,t)^2\nabla\cdot\left(\left(\frac{\nabla\sigma_\epsilon}{\sigma_\epsilon} - \frac{\nabla\sigma}{\sigma}\right)\mathcal{B}(x)\right)dx \\
&\le \|z_\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}}\|\partial_t z_\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}} + \|z_\epsilon(t)\|_\infty^2\left(\int_{\partial B_\epsilon}|x|^{-2\gamma-1}dx + \int_{B_\epsilon}|x|^{-2\gamma-2}dx\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore there exists $c > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{t\in(0,\infty)} \|\nabla z_\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}} \le c. \tag{29}$$

Furthermore we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} |\nabla z_\epsilon(x,t) - \nabla z_{\epsilon'}(x,t))|^2\mathcal{B}(x)dx \\
&\quad= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} (z_\epsilon(x,t) - z_{\epsilon'}(x,t))\nabla\big(\mathcal{B}(x)(\nabla z_\epsilon(x,t) - \nabla z_{\epsilon'}(x,t))\big)dx \\
&\quad= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+\setminus B_\epsilon} (z_\epsilon(x,t) - z_{\epsilon'}(x,t))(\partial_t z_\epsilon(x,t) - \partial_t z_{\epsilon'}(x,t))\mathcal{B}(x)dx \\
&\qquad\qquad + \int_{B_\epsilon} (z_\epsilon(x,t) - z_{\epsilon'}(x,t))\nabla\big(\mathcal{B}(x)(\nabla z_\epsilon(x,t) - \nabla z_{\epsilon'}(x,t))\big)dx \\
&\quad\le \|z_\epsilon(t) - z_{\epsilon'}(t))\|_{\mathcal{B}}\|\partial_t z_\epsilon(t) - \partial_t z_{\epsilon'}(t))\|_{\mathcal{B}} + J_\epsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

Then from (20), J_ϵ is estimated as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
J_\epsilon &= \int_{B_\epsilon} (z_\epsilon(x,t) - z_{\epsilon'}(x,t)) \nabla\big(\mathcal{B}(x)(\nabla z_\epsilon(x,t) - \nabla z_{\epsilon'}(x,t))\big) dx \\
&= \int_{B_\epsilon} (z_\epsilon(x,t) - z_{\epsilon'}(x,t))(\Delta z_\epsilon(x,t) - \Delta z_{\epsilon'}(x,t))\mathcal{B}(x) dx \\
&\qquad + \int_{B_\epsilon} (z_\epsilon(x,t) - z_{\epsilon'}(x,t)) \frac{2\nabla\sigma}{\sigma} \cdot (\nabla z_\epsilon(x,t) - \nabla z_{\epsilon'}(x,t))\mathcal{B}(x) dx \\
&= \int_{B_\epsilon} (z_\epsilon(x,t) - z_{\epsilon'}(x,t))(\partial_t z_\epsilon(x,t) - \partial_t z_{\epsilon'}(x,t))\mathcal{B}(x) dx \\
&\qquad + \int_{B_\epsilon} (z_\epsilon(x,t) - z_{\epsilon'}(x,t)) \left(\frac{2\nabla\sigma_\epsilon}{\sigma_\epsilon} \cdot \nabla z_\epsilon(x,t) - \frac{2\nabla\sigma_{\epsilon'}}{\sigma_{\epsilon'}} \cdot \nabla z_{\epsilon'}(x,t) \right) \mathcal{B}(x) dx \\
&\qquad\quad + \int_{B_\epsilon} (z_\epsilon(x,t) - z_{\epsilon'}(x,t)) \frac{2\nabla\sigma}{\sigma} \cdot (\nabla z_\epsilon(x,t) - \nabla z_{\epsilon'}(x,t))\mathcal{B}(x) dx \\
&\le \|z_\epsilon(t) - z_{\epsilon'}(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}} \|\partial_t z_\epsilon(t) - \partial_t z_{\epsilon'}(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}} \\
&\qquad + c\|z_\epsilon(t) - z_{\epsilon'}(t)\|_\infty \Big(\|\nabla z_\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}} + \|\nabla z_{\epsilon'}(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}} \Big) \left(\int_{B_\epsilon} |x|^{-2} \mathcal{B}(x) dx \right)^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, by virtue of (29), we obtain

$$\lim_{\epsilon\to\infty} J_\epsilon = 0 \quad \text{uniformly for } t \in [0, t_0)$$

with any fixed $t_0 > 0$. This implies

$$\lim_{\epsilon,\epsilon'\to\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} |\nabla z_\epsilon(x,t) - \nabla z_{\epsilon'}(x,t)|^2 \sigma(x)^2 dx = 0 \quad \text{uniformly for } t \in [0, t_0)$$

with any fixed $t_0 > 0$. Finally we verify a conservation in $L^1_{\mathcal{B}}$. Let $s_\mu(\zeta)$ be a nondecreasing smooth function such that $s_\mu(\zeta) = 0$ if $\zeta \le 0$, $s_\mu(\zeta) = 1$ if $\zeta > 2\mu$ and $|s'_\mu(\zeta)| < c/\mu$. Set $S_\mu(\zeta) = \int_0^\zeta s_\mu(a) da$. Then since $z_\epsilon \in C^1([0,\infty); L^1_{\mathcal{B}_\epsilon}) \cap C([0,\infty); H^1_{\mathcal{B}_\epsilon})$, we get for $0 < \epsilon' < \epsilon$

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} S_\mu(z_\epsilon - z_{\epsilon'}) \theta_\epsilon(x)^2 \mathcal{B}(x) dx &= -\int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} (\nabla z_\epsilon - \nabla z_{\epsilon'}) \cdot \nabla \left(s_\mu(z_\epsilon - z_{\epsilon'}) \theta_\epsilon(x)^2 \right) \mathcal{B}(x) dx \\
&\le 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} |\nabla z_\epsilon - \nabla z_{\epsilon'}| |\nabla \theta_\epsilon| \mathcal{B}(x) dx \\
&\le c\|\nabla z_\epsilon - \nabla z_{\epsilon'}\|_{\mathcal{B}} \left(\epsilon^{-2} \int_{B_\epsilon} \mathcal{B}(x) dx \right)^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore integrating both sides and taking $\mu \to 0$, we obtain

$$\|(z_\epsilon(t) - z_{\epsilon'}(t))_+\|_{L^1_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathbb{R}^n_+ \setminus B_\epsilon)} \le c \left(\epsilon^{-2} \int_{B_\epsilon} \mathcal{B}(x) dx \right)^{1/2} \int_0^t \|\nabla z_\epsilon(\tau) - \nabla z_{\epsilon'}(\tau)\|_{\mathcal{B}} d\tau.$$

Since estimates of $(z_\epsilon - z_{\epsilon'})_-$ is derived by the same way, we obtain

$$\|z_\epsilon(t) - z_{\epsilon'}(t)\|_{L^1_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathbb{R}^n_+ \setminus B_\epsilon)} \le c \left(\epsilon^{-2} \int_{B_\epsilon} \mathcal{B}(x) dx \right)^{1/2} \int_0^t \|\nabla z_\epsilon(\tau) - \nabla z_{\epsilon'}(\tau)\|_{\mathcal{B}} d\tau. \tag{30}$$

Since $\int_{R^n_+} z_\epsilon(x,t)\mathcal{B}_\epsilon(x)dx = \int_{R^n_+} z_0(x)\mathcal{B}_\epsilon(x)dx$, by using (23), (29)-(30) and $2\gamma < (n-2)$, we find that $z_{\epsilon_k}(t)$ converges to $z(t)$ in $C([0,t_0];L^1_{\mathcal{B}})$ and it satisfies $\int_{R^n_+} z(x,t)\mathcal{B}(x)dx = \int_{R^n_+} z_0(x)\mathcal{B}(x)dx$. Therefore from above a priori estimates, this limiting function $z(x,t)$ is assumed to be

$$z(x,t) \in C([0,\infty);L^1_{\mathcal{B}} \cap L^2_{\mathcal{B}}) \cap C^1((0,\infty);L^2_{\mathcal{B}}) \cap C([0,\infty);H^1_{\mathcal{B}}).$$

Furthermore it solves

$$\begin{cases} (z_t(t),\zeta)_{\mathcal{B}} = (\nabla z(t),\nabla\zeta)_{\mathcal{B}}, \quad \forall \zeta \in C^\infty_c(\overline{\mathbb{R}^n_+}), \qquad t>0, \\ z(0) = z_0. \end{cases}$$

Since $z_{\epsilon_k} \to z$ in $C^1([0,t_0];L^2_{\mathcal{B}}) \cap C([0,t_0];H^1_{\mathcal{B}})$ for any fixed t_0, by using (24) and (27), we see that

$$\|z(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}} + \sqrt{t}\|\nabla z(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}} + t\|\partial_t z(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}} \le c\|z_0\|_{\mathcal{B}}.$$

Since $X = \{\zeta \in C^\infty_c(\mathbb{R}^n_+); \partial_\nu \zeta = 0 \text{ on } \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+\}$ is dense in $L^2_{\mathcal{B}} \cap L^1_{\mathcal{B}}$, by a density argument, we obtain the conclusion. ☐

We define a semigroup $e^{A_0 t}$: $L^2_{\mathcal{B}} \to L^2_{\mathcal{B}}$ by $e^{A_0 t} z_0 = z(t)$, where $z(t)$ is a unique solution of (19) given in Lemma 4.3. Now we construct the heat kernel of (19) (see e.g. Theorem 7.7 and Theorem 7.13 in [6]) First we provide fundamental properties of $e^{A_0 t}$.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $e^{A_0 t}$: $L^2_{\mathcal{B}} \to L^2_{\mathcal{B}}$ be a semigroup defined above. Then there exists $\nu > 0$ such that*

(i) $\|e^{A_0 t} z_0\|_{\mathcal{B}} \le \|z_0\|_{\mathcal{B}}$ *for* $t > 0$*,*

(ii) $\|e^{A_0 t} z_0\|_\infty \le ct^{-\nu/2}\|z_0\|_{L^1_{\mathcal{B}}}$ *for* $t > 0$*,*

(iii) $\|e^{A_0 t} z_0\|_\infty \le ct^{-\nu/4}\|z_0\|_{\mathcal{B}}$ *for* $t > 0$*.*

Furthermore let $z(x,t) = (e^{A_0 t} z_0)(x)$ and $z_0 \in L^2_{\mathcal{B}}$. Then it holds that

$$z(x,t) \in C^{2,1}(\overline{\mathbb{R}^n_+} \setminus \{0\} \times (0,\infty)). \tag{31}$$

Proof. By Lemma 4.3, we note that $\partial_t \|u(t)\|^2_{\mathcal{B}} = -2\|\nabla u(t)\|^2_{\mathcal{B}}$. This implies (i). Next we will show (ii). We recall the Caffarelli-Kohn-Nirenberg inequality:

$$\big\||x|^m u\big\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^n_+)} \le c\big\||x|^\alpha |\nabla u|\big\|^a_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n_+)} \big\||x|^\beta u\big\|^{1-a}_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^n_+)}, \tag{32}$$

where $p, q \ge 1$, $r > 0$, $0 \le a \le 1$, $m = a\sigma + (1-a)\beta$ and

$$\frac{1}{p} + \frac{\alpha}{n} > 0, \qquad \frac{1}{q} + \frac{\beta}{n} > 0, \qquad \frac{1}{r} + \frac{m}{n} > 0,$$

$$\frac{1}{r} + \frac{m}{n} = a\left(\frac{1}{p} + \frac{\alpha-1}{n}\right) + (1-a)\left(\frac{1}{q} + \frac{\beta}{n}\right)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\alpha - \sigma \ge 0 \quad \text{if } a > 0, \\ &\alpha - \sigma \le 1 \quad \text{if } a > 0, \ \frac{1}{r} + \frac{m}{n} = \frac{1}{p} + \frac{\alpha-1}{n}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we recall that $\mathcal{B}(x) \sim |x|^{-2\gamma}$. Then by using the Caffarelli-Kohn-Nirenberg inequality with $m = \alpha = -\gamma$, $\beta = -2\gamma$, $r = p = 2$, $q = 1$, we get

$$\|z\|_{\mathcal{B}} \le c\|\nabla z\|^a_{\mathcal{B}} \|z\|^{1-a}_{L^1_{\mathcal{B}}}$$

for some $a \in (0,1)$. Therefore from Theorem 4.1.1 in [22], we obtain

$$\|e^{A_0 t} z_0\|_{\mathcal{B}} \le c t^{-\nu/2} \|z_0\|_{L^1_{\mathcal{B}}}, \qquad t > 0,$$

where $\nu/2 = a/(1-a)$, which shows (ii). As a consequence, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \|e^{A_0 t} z_0\|_{\mathcal{B}} &= \|e^{A_0 t/2} e^{A_0 t/2} z_0\|_{L^2_{\mathcal{B}}} \le c t^{-\nu/4} \|e^{A_0 t/2} z_0\|_{L^1_{\mathcal{B}}} \\ &\le c t^{-\nu/4} \|z_0\|_{L^1_{\mathcal{B}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $e^{A_0 t}$ is a bounded self-adjoint operator on $L^2_{\mathcal{B}}$, by the duality, we obtain (iii). Since $\sigma(x)$ is positive and smooth on $\overline{\mathbb{R}^n_+} \setminus \{0\}$, by virtue of (ii), a local regularity theory for parabolic equations implies (31). ☐

Following p. p. 198 - 200 in [6], we construct the heat kernel of (18). By virtue of (31), for any fixed $t > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$, the mapping $z_0 \mapsto (e^{A_0 t} z_0)(x)$: $L^2_{\mathcal{B}} \to \mathbb{R}$ becomes a bounded linear operator. Therefore by the Riesz representation theorem, there exists $\hat{p}_{t,x}(\zeta) \in L^2_{\mathcal{B}}$ such that

$$(\hat{p}_{t,x}, f)_{\mathcal{B}} = (e^{A_0 t} f)(x), \qquad \forall f \in L^2_{\mathcal{B}}.$$

Then it is verified that

$$\hat{p}_{t,x}(\zeta) > 0, \qquad \hat{p}_{t,x} \in L^1_{\mathcal{B}}, \qquad \|\hat{p}_{t,x}\|_{L^1_{\mathcal{B}}} = 1, \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}^n_+,\ t > 0.$$

Moreover by Lemma 4.4 (ii), the duality argument shows

$$\|\hat{p}_{t,x}\|_\infty \le c t^{-\nu/2}, \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}^n_+,\ t > 0,$$

where $c > 0$ is a constant independent of x and t. We put

$$p(x,\xi,t) = (\hat{p}_{t/2,x}, \hat{p}_{t/2,\xi})_{\mathcal{B}}, \qquad x, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n_+,\ t > 0.$$

Then from Theorem 7.13 in [6], $e^{A_0 t} z_0$ is expressed by

$$(e^{A_0 t} z_0)(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} p(x,\xi,t) z_0(\xi) \mathcal{B}(\xi) d\xi, \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}^n_+,\ t > 0$$

for $z_0 \in L^2_{\mathcal{B}}$. Then Lemma 4.3 implies

$$e^{A_0 t} z_0 \in C([0,\infty); L^2_{\mathcal{B}}) \cap C^1((0,\infty); L^2_{\mathcal{B}}) \cap C((0,\infty); H^1_{\mathcal{B}}), \qquad z_0 \in L^2_{\mathcal{B}}.$$

Lemma 4.5. *Let $p(x,\xi,t)$ be defined above. Then $p(\cdot,\xi,\cdot) \in C^{2,1}(\mathbb{R}^n_+ \times (0,\infty))$ satisfies* (18) *for any fixed $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n_+$. Furthermore for $r > 0$ and $t_0 > 0$ there exists $c(r,t_0) > 0$ such that*

$$|p_t(x,\xi,t)| + |\nabla_x p(x,\xi,t)| + |D^2_x p(x,\xi,t)| \le c(r,t_0), \qquad |x| > r,\ \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n_+,\ t > t_0.$$

Proof. By definition of $p(x,\xi,t)$, we observe that $p(x,\xi,t) = (e^{A_0 t/2}[\hat{p}_{t/2,\xi}(\cdot)])(x)$. Hence $p(\cdot,\xi,\cdot)$ satisfies (18) for any fixed $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n_+$. Furthermore from Lemma 4.4 and $\|\hat{p}_{t/2.\xi}\|_{L^1_{\mathcal{B}}} = 1$, there exists $\nu_p > 0$ and $c_p > 0$ for $p \ge 2$

$$\|p(x,\xi,t)\|_{L^p_{\mathcal{B}},dx} \le c_p t^{-\nu_p} \|\hat{p}_{t/2,\xi}\|_{L^1_{\mathcal{B}}} \le c_p t^{-\nu_p}.$$

Since coefficients $\nabla\sigma/\sigma$ of (18) is bounded far from the origin, by a parabolic regularity theory, for $r > 0$ and $t_0 > 0$ there exists $c(r,t_0) > 0$ such that

$$|p_t(x,\xi,t)| + |\nabla_x p(x,\xi,t)| + |D^2_x p(x,\xi,t)| \le c(r,t_0), \qquad |x| > r,\ \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n_+,\ t > t_0,$$

which completes the proof. ☐

To apply Theorem 2.7 in [7], we prepare several lemmas. Let

$$V(x_0,R)=\int_{B(x_0,R)}\mathcal{B}(x)dx.$$

Lemma 4.6 (Doubling property)**.** *There exists* $c>0$ *such that*

$$V(x_0,2R)\le cV(x_0,R)\quad \text{for } x_0\in\mathbb{R}^n_+,\ R>0. \tag{33}$$

Furthermore there exist $c_1,c_2>0$ *such that*

$$c_1R^n(|x_0|+R)^{-2\gamma}<V(x_0,R)<c_2R^n(|x_0|+R)^{-2\gamma}.$$

Proof. Repeating calculations as in the proof of Proposition 4.1 in [19], we obtain the conclusion. □

Here we recall a fundamental result concerning the volume growth (see Lemma 5.2.7 in [22]).

Lemma 4.7. *Assume* (33)*. Then there exists* $c>0$ *such that*

$$V(x_1,r)\le e^{c|x_1-x_2|/r}V(x_2,r),\qquad x_1,x_2\in\mathbb{R}^n_+,\ r>0.$$

Lemma 4.8 (Weighted Poincaré inequality)**.** *There exists* $c>0$ *such that*

$$\inf_{\xi\in\mathbb{R}}\int_{B(x_0,R)}|f(x)-\xi|^2\mathcal{B}(x)dx\le cR^2\int_{B(x_0,R)}|\nabla f(x)|^2\mathcal{B}(x)dx,\qquad \forall f\in C^1(\overline{B(x_0,R)}).$$

Proof. The proof follows from Proposition 4.3 in [19] with a slight modification. □

Remark 4.1. *It is known that*

$$\inf_{\xi\in\mathbb{R}}\int_{B(x_0,R)}|f(x)-\xi|^2\mathcal{B}(x)dx=\int_{B(x_0,R)}|f(x)-f_{\mathrm{av}}(x)|^2\mathcal{B}(x)dx,\qquad \forall f\in C^1(\overline{B(x_0,R)}),$$

where $f_{\mathrm{av}}(x)$ *is the average of* $f(x)$ *on* $B(x_0,R)$*.*

Therefore Theorem 2.7 in [7] implies the following the heat kernel estimates.

$$\frac{c_1}{V(x,\sqrt{t})}\exp\left(-\frac{c_3|x-\xi|^2}{t}\right)<p(x,\xi,t)<\frac{c_2}{V(x,\sqrt{t})}\exp\left(-\frac{c_4|x-\xi|^2}{t}\right). \tag{34}$$

Applying Lemma 4.6 - Lemma 4.7 to (34), we obtain the desired lower and upper estimates of $p(x,\xi,t)$.

Lemma 4.9. *Let* $k_\gamma(\xi,t)=\left(|\xi|+\sqrt{t}\right)^\gamma$*. Then there exist* c_i $(i=1,2,3,4)$ *such that*

$$c_1\left(\frac{k_\gamma(\xi,t)^2}{t^{n/2}}\right)\exp\left(-\frac{c_3|x-\xi|^2}{t}\right)\le p(x,\xi,t)\le c_2\left(\frac{k_\gamma(\xi,t)^2}{t^{n/2}}\right)\exp\left(-\frac{c_4|x-\xi|^2}{t}\right),$$

Furthermore it is known that c_4 in Lemma 4.9 can be chosen arbitrarily close to 1/4 (see (5.2.17) and Theorem 5.3.3 in [22]), which is stated as follows.

Lemma 4.10. *Let* $k_\gamma(x,t)$ *be as in Lemma* 4.9*. For any* $\epsilon>0$ *there exists* $c_\epsilon>0$ *such that*

$$p(x,\xi,t)\le c_\epsilon\left(\frac{k_\gamma(\xi,t)^2}{t^{n/2}}\right)\exp\left(-\frac{|x-\xi|^2}{4(1+\epsilon)t}\right).$$

4.2 Backward type linear parabolic equations

In this subsection, we study the backward type linear parabolic equations.

$$\begin{cases} b_s = \dfrac{1}{\mathcal{C}} \mathrm{div}\,(\mathcal{C}\nabla b)\,, & (y,s) \in \mathbb{R}^n_+ \times (0,\infty), \\ \partial_\nu b = 0, & (y,s) \in \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+ \times (0,\infty), \\ b(y,0) = b_0(y), & y \in \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+, \end{cases} \tag{35}$$

where

$$\mathcal{C}(y) = \sigma(y)^2 \rho(y).$$

Here we introduce suitable functional spaces related to (35). Set

$$L^p_{\mathcal{C}} = \left\{ b \in L^p_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n_+); \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} |b(y)|^p \mathcal{C}(y) dy \right\}, \qquad H^1_{\mathcal{C}} = \left\{ b \in L^2_{\mathcal{C}}; \nabla b \in L^2_{\mathcal{C}} \right\}.$$

Let $H^*_{\mathcal{C}}$ be the dual space of $H^*_{\mathcal{C}}$ and define a operator $\mathcal{A}_0$: $D(\mathcal{A}_0) \to H^*_{\mathcal{C}}$ with $D(\mathcal{A}_0) = H^1_{\mathcal{C}}$ by

$${}_{H^*_{\mathcal{C}}}\langle \mathcal{A}_0 b, \eta \rangle_{H_{\mathcal{C}}} := -(\nabla b, \nabla \eta)_{\mathcal{C}}.$$

In the same manner as before, $e^{\mathcal{A}_0 t} b_0$ defines a semigroup on $L^2_{\mathcal{C}}$. Then it is verified that $e^{\mathcal{A}_0 s}$ is symmetric on $L^2_{\mathcal{C}}$, that is

$$(e^{\mathcal{A}_0 s} b_1, b_2)_{\mathcal{C}} = (b_1, e^{\mathcal{A}_0 s} b_2)_{\mathcal{C}}, \qquad b_1, b_2 \in L^2_{\mathcal{C}}, \quad t > 0. \tag{36}$$

To obtain the heat kernel of (35), we change variables.

$$z(x,t) = b\left((1-t)^{-1/2} x, -\log(1-t) \right).$$

Then $z(x,t)$ satisfies (18) with the initial data $z_0(x) = b_0(x)$. Since $z(x,t)$ is given by

$$z(x,t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} p(x,\xi,t) b_0(\xi) \mathcal{B}(\xi) d\xi,$$

by using $x = e^{-s/2} y$ and $t = 1 - e^{-s}$, we see that

$$(e^{\mathcal{A}_0 t} b_0)(y) = z\left(e^{-s/2} y, 1 - e^{-s} \right) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} \Theta(y,\xi,s) b_0(\xi) \mathcal{B}(\xi) d\xi,$$

where $\Theta(y,\xi,s)$ is given by

$$\Theta(y,\xi,s) = p\left(e^{-s/2} y, \xi, 1 - e^{-s} \right).$$

Then from Lemma 4.5, we find that $\Theta(\cdot,\xi,\cdot) \in C^{2,1}(\mathbb{R}^n_+ \times (0,\infty))$ satisfies (35) for any fixed $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n_+$. Furthermore from Lemma 4.5, for any r and $s_0 \in (0,1)$ there exists $c(r,s_0) > 0$ such that

$$|\Theta_s(y,\xi,s)| + |\nabla_y \Theta(y,\xi,s)| + |D^2_y \Theta(y,\xi,s)| \le c(r,s_0)(1+|y|) \tag{37}$$

for $|y| > r$, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n_+$, $s_0 < s < s_0^{-1}$. Moreover by virtue of (36), it holds that

$$\Theta(y,\xi,s) e^{-|y|^2/4} = \Theta(\xi,y,s) e^{-|\xi|^2/4}. \tag{38}$$

Next we consider non-homogeneous problems.

$$\begin{cases} b_s = \dfrac{1}{\mathcal{C}}\mathrm{div}\,(\mathcal{C}\nabla b)\,, & (y,s) \in \mathbb{R}^n_+ \times (0,\infty), \\ \partial_\nu b = f(y',s), & (y',s) \in \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+ \times (0,\infty), \\ b(y,0) = 0, & y \in \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+. \end{cases} \tag{39}$$

Let $s' > 0$ and assume $f(y',s) \in BC(\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+ \times [0,s'))$. Furthermore let $b(y,s) \in BC(\overline{\mathbb{R}^n_+} \times [0,s')) \cap BC^{2,1}(\mathbb{R}^n_+ \times [\epsilon,s'))$ for any $\epsilon > 0$ be a classical solution of (39). We denote by $\theta_\epsilon(y)$ a cut off function such that $\theta_\epsilon(y) = 0$ if $|y| < \epsilon$, $\theta_\epsilon(y) = 1$ if $|y| > 2\epsilon$ and $|D^i\theta_\epsilon(y)| < c\epsilon^{-i}$ $(i = 1,2)$. Here we put

$$A^\epsilon(y,s,\tau) = e^{|y|^2/4}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} \Theta(\mu,y,s-\tau)\theta_\epsilon(\mu)b(\mu,\tau)\mathcal{C}(\mu)d\mu, \qquad 0 < \tau < s.$$

From (37), we find that $A^\epsilon(y,s,\tau)$ is differentiable with respect to τ for $0 < \tau < s$ and it satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} A^\epsilon_\tau(y,s,\tau) \,=\, & -e^{|y|^2/4}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} \Theta_s(\mu,y,s-\tau)\theta_\epsilon(\mu)b(\mu,\tau)\mathcal{C}(\mu)d\mu \\ & \qquad + e^{|y|^2/4}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} \Theta(\mu,y,s-\tau)\theta_\epsilon(\mu)b_s(\mu,\tau)\mathcal{C}(\mu)d\mu \end{aligned}$$

for $0 < \tau < s$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^n_+$. Then since $\Theta(\cdot,y,\cdot)$ satisfies (35) for any fixed $y \in \mathbb{R}^n_+$, by using $\partial_\nu\theta_\epsilon = 0$ on $\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} \Theta_s(\mu,y,s-\tau)\theta_\epsilon b\mathcal{C}d\mu &= -\int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} \nabla_\mu\Theta(\mu,y,s-\tau)\cdot\nabla(\theta_\epsilon b)\mathcal{C}d\mu \\ = -\int_{\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+} & \Theta(\mu',y,s-\tau)\theta_\epsilon f(\mu',\tau)\mathcal{C}d\mu' + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} \Theta(\mu,y,s-\tau)\theta_\epsilon b_s\mathcal{C}d\mu \\ & + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} \Theta(\mu,y,s-\tau)\left(2\nabla\theta_\epsilon\cdot\nabla b + \left(\Delta\theta_\epsilon + \frac{\nabla\theta_\epsilon\cdot\nabla\mathcal{C}}{\mathcal{C}}\right)b\right)\mathcal{C}d\mu. \end{aligned}$$

Here we denote the last term by $R_\epsilon(y,s,\tau)$. Integrating over $(\delta, s-\delta)$ both sides, we get

$$\begin{aligned} A^\epsilon(y,s,s-\delta) \,=\, A^\epsilon(y,s,\delta) + e^{|y|^2/4}\Bigg(&\int_\delta^{s-\delta} d\tau \int_{\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+} \Theta(\mu',y,s-\tau)\theta_\epsilon f\,\mathcal{C}d\mu' \\ & - \int_\delta^{s-\delta} R_\epsilon(y,s,\tau)d\tau\Bigg). \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

Then since $\mathcal{C}(\mu) \sim |\mu|^{-2\gamma}$ for $|y| \leq 1$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} |R_\epsilon| &\leq c \sup_{\delta<\tau<s-\delta} \|b(\cdot,\tau)\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n_+)} \int_{B_{2\epsilon}} \left(|\nabla\theta_\epsilon| + |\Delta\theta_\epsilon| + \frac{|\nabla\theta_\epsilon|}{|\mu|}\right)|\mu|^{-2\gamma}d\mu \\ &\leq c \sup_{\delta<\tau<s-\delta} \|b(\cdot,\tau)\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n_+)} \left(\epsilon^{-2}\cdot\epsilon^{n-2\gamma} + \epsilon^{-1}\cdot\epsilon^{n-1-2\gamma}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence since $b(y,s) \in BC^{2,1}(\mathbb{R}_+ \times (\delta,s))$ and $2\gamma < n-2$, it holds that

$$\lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\int_\delta^{s-\delta} R_\epsilon(y,s,\tau)d\tau = 0 \qquad \text{for any } \delta > 0.$$

Therefore since $b(y,s) \in BC(\overline{\mathbb{R}^n_+} \times [0,s'))$ and $f(y',s) \in BC(\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+ \times [0,s'))$, by taking $\epsilon \to 0$ in (40), we obtain

$$A(y,s,s-\delta) = A(y,s,\delta) + e^{|y|^2/4}\int_\delta^{s-\delta} d\tau \int_{\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+} \Theta(\mu',y,s-\tau)f\,\mathcal{C}d\mu'$$

for any fixed $\delta > 0$, where $A(y,s,\tau)$ is defined by

$$A(y,s,\tau) = e^{|y|^2/4}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} \Theta(\mu,y,s-\tau)b(\mu,\tau)\mathcal{C}(\mu)d\mu.$$

Here from (38), we note that

$$A(y,s,s-\delta) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} \Theta(y,\mu,\delta)b(\mu,s-\delta)\mathcal{B}(\mu)d\mu = e^{\mathcal{A}_0\delta}b(s-\delta).$$

Furthermore we recall that $b(y,0)\equiv 0$. Therefore since $b(y,s)\in BC(\overline{\mathbb{R}^n_+}\times[0,s'))$ and $b(y',s)\in BC(\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+\times[0,s'))$, we take $\delta\to 0$ to obtain

$$b(y,s) = \int_0^s d\tau \int_{\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+} \Theta(y,\mu',s-\tau)f(\mu',\tau)\mathcal{B}(\mu')d\mu'.$$

Summing up the above facts, we obtain the Duhamel principle for solution of (39).

Proposition 4.1. *Let $f(y,s)\in BC(\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+\times[0,s')$ and $b(y,s)$ be a solution of (39) with $b(y,0)=b_0(y)$. Then if $b(y,s)\in BC(\overline{\mathbb{R}^n_+}\times[0,s'))\cap BC^{2,1}(\mathbb{R}^n_+\times[\epsilon,s'))$ for any $\epsilon>0$, it is expressed by*

$$b(y,s) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+}\Theta(y,\xi,s)b_0(\xi)\mathcal{B}(\xi)d\xi + \int_0^s d\tau\int_{\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+}\Theta(y,\xi',s-\tau)f(\xi',\tau)\mathcal{B}(\xi')d\xi'.$$

Furthermore it holds that

$$\Theta(y,\xi,s) \leq c\frac{\left(|\xi|+\sqrt{1-e^{-s}}\right)^{2\gamma}}{(1-e^{-s})^{n/2}}\exp\left(-\frac{|e^{-s/2}y-\xi|^2}{6(1-e^{-s})}\right).$$

Proof. The Duhamel principle follows from the above argument. Furthermore by using Lemma 4.10 with $\epsilon = 1/2$, then we obtain the upper bound of $\Theta(y,\xi,s)$. □

Finally we provide the L^∞-L^2 type estimate for solutions of (35).

Lemma 4.11. *There exists $c>0$ such that*

$$|e^{\mathcal{A}_0 s}b_0| < \frac{c\|b_0\|_{\mathcal{C}}}{(1-e^{-s})^{n/2}} \quad \text{for } |y|<e^{s/2}.$$

Proof. Put $r_1 = \sqrt{7}/(\sqrt{7}-\sqrt{6})$. Then a direct computation shows that

$$\frac{|e^{-s/2}y-\xi|^2}{6} \geq \frac{|\xi|^2}{7} \quad \text{for } |\xi|>r_1,\ |y|<e^{s/2}. \tag{41}$$

From Proposition 4.1, we observe that

$$e^{\mathcal{A}_0 s}b_0 = \left(\int_0^{r_1}+\int_{r_1}^\infty\right)\Theta(y,\xi,s)b_0(\xi)\mathcal{B}(\xi)d\xi. \tag{42}$$

By the Schwarz inequality, the first integral is estimated by

$$\int_0^{r_1}\Theta(y,\xi,s)b_0(\xi)\mathcal{B}(\xi)d\xi \leq \left(\int_0^{r_1}\Theta(y,\xi,s)^2\mathcal{B}(\xi)d\xi\right)^{1/2}\left(\int_0^{r_1}b_0(y)^2\mathcal{B}(\xi)d\xi\right)^{1/2}.$$

Here we note that $\mathcal{B}(\xi) \leq c|\xi|^{-2\gamma}$ and $\sqrt{1-e^{-s}} < 1$. Therefore Proposition 4.1 implies

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^{r_1} \Theta(y,\xi,s)^2 \mathcal{B}(\xi) d\xi &\leq \frac{c}{(1-e^{-s})^n} \int_0^{r_1} \left(|\xi| + \sqrt{1-e^{-s}}\right)^{4\gamma} |\xi|^{-2\gamma} d\xi \\ &\leq \frac{c(r_1+1)^{4\gamma}}{(1-e^{-s})^n} \int_0^{r_1} |\xi|^{-2\gamma} d\xi.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\gamma < (n-2)/2$, we obtain

$$\int_0^{r_1} \Theta(y,\xi,s)^2 \mathcal{B}(\xi) d\xi \leq \frac{c}{(1-e^{-s})^n}.$$

Furthermore it holds from $\mathcal{B}(\xi) = e^{|\xi|^2/4}\mathcal{C}(\xi)$ that

$$\int_0^{r_1} b_0(y)^2 \mathcal{B}(\xi) d\xi \leq e^{r_1^2/4} \int_0^{r_1} b_0(y)^2 \mathcal{C}(\xi) d\xi \leq e^{r_1^2/4} \|b_0\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2.$$

Therefore we obtain

$$\int_0^{r_1} \Theta(y,\xi,s) b_0(\xi) \mathcal{B}(\xi) d\xi \leq \frac{c\|b_0\|_{\mathcal{C}}}{(1-e^{-s})^{n/2}}.$$

Next we estimate the second integral in (42). By (41), we note that

$$\exp\left(-\frac{|e^{-s/2}y-\xi|^2}{6(1-e^{-s})}\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{|\xi|^2}{7(1-e^{-s})}\right) \leq e^{-|\xi|^2/7}$$

for $|\xi| > r_1$ and $|y| < e^{s/2}$. Therefore since $1/7 = 1/8 + 1/56$, by the Schwarz inequality, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{r_1}^{\infty} \Theta(y,\xi,s) b_0(\xi) \mathcal{B}(\xi) d\xi &\leq c \int_{r_1}^{\infty} \frac{\left(|\xi| + \sqrt{1-e^{-s}}\right)^{2\gamma}}{(1-e^{-s})^{n/2}} e^{-|\xi|^2/7} |b_0(\xi)| \mathcal{B}(\xi) d\xi \\ &\leq c \left(\int_{r_1}^{\infty} \frac{\left(|\xi| + \sqrt{1-e^{-s}}\right)^{4\gamma}}{(1-e^{-s})^n} e^{-|\xi|^2/28} \mathcal{B}(\xi) d\xi\right)^{1/2} \left(\int_{r_1}^{\infty} b_0(\xi)^2 e^{-|\xi|^2/4} \mathcal{B}(\xi) d\xi\right)^{1/2}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\sqrt{1-e^{-s}} < 1$ and $\mathcal{C}(\xi) = e^{-|\xi|^2/4}\mathcal{B}(\xi)$, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{r_1}^{\infty} \Theta(y,\xi,s) b_0(\xi) \mathcal{B}(\xi) d\xi &\leq \frac{c}{(1-e^{-s})^n} \left(\int_{r_1}^{\infty} (|\xi|+1)^{4\gamma} |\xi|^{-2\gamma} e^{-|\xi|^2/28} d\xi\right)^{1/2} \|b_0\|_{\mathcal{C}} \\ &\leq \frac{c\|b_0\|_{\mathcal{C}}}{(1-e^{-s})^{n/2}}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus the proof is completed. □

5 Functional setting

In this section, we introduce a functional space for a fixed point theorem and provide fundamental estimates for Section 6 - Section 8. Here we use the same transformation as in Section 4.1.

$$b(y,s) = \Phi(y,s)/\sigma(y),$$

where $\sigma(y)$ is a function given at the beginning of Section 4.1. Then $b(y,s)$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} b_s = \dfrac{1}{\mathcal{C}}\nabla\left(\mathcal{C}\nabla b\right) + \left(\dfrac{\gamma-m}{2}\right)b, & (y,s)\in\mathbb{R}^n_+\times(s_1,\infty),\\ \partial_\nu b = f(\Phi)/\sigma, & (y,s)\in\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+\times(s_1,\infty),\\ b(y,s_1) = b_1(y) := \Phi_0(y)/\sigma(y), & y\in\mathbb{R}^n_+, \end{cases} \tag{43}$$

where we replaced the initial time s_T by s_1. We recall that $\mathcal{K} = qV|_{\theta=\pi/2}^{q-1}$ and

$$f(\Phi) = (\Phi+U_\infty)^q - U_\infty^q - \mathcal{K}r^{-1}\Phi. \tag{44}$$

Let $e^{\mathcal{A}s}$ be the semigroup of (43) with replaced its boundary condition by zero Neumann boundary condition. Therefore $e^{\mathcal{A}(s-s_1)}$ is written by

$$e^{\mathcal{A}(s-s_1)} = e^{(\gamma-m)(s-s_1)/2}e^{\mathcal{A}_0(s-s_1)},$$

where $e^{\mathcal{A}_0(s-s_1)}$ is the semigroup defined in Section 4.2. Furthermore by Proposition 4.1, $b(y,s)$ is expressed by

$$b(y,s) = e^{\mathcal{A}(s-s_1)}b_1 + \int_{s_1}^{s} e^{\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)}F(\tau)d\tau, \tag{45}$$

where $F(\xi,s) = f(\Phi(\xi,s))/\sigma(\xi')$ and

$$e^{\mathcal{A}s}b_1 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+}\Gamma(y,\xi,s)b_1(\xi)\mathcal{B}(\xi)d\xi, \qquad e^{\mathcal{B}s}F = \int_{\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+}\Gamma(y,\xi',s)F(\xi')\mathcal{B}(\xi')d\xi'$$

with $\Gamma(y,\xi,s) = e^{(\gamma-m)s/2}\Theta(y,\xi,s)$.

Here we prepare notations for convenience. Throughout this section, we fix $\ell\in\mathbb{N}$ such that $\lambda_{1\ell}>0$ and put

$$\lambda^* = \lambda_{1\ell}, \qquad \omega = \lambda^*/(\gamma-m) > 0.$$

Let $k_\alpha = \alpha^{-(\gamma-m)/m}k_1$ be defined in Theorem 3.1 (iv) and $c_{1\ell}$ be defined in Lemma A.1. We choose $\alpha>0$ such that

$$k_\alpha = c_{1\ell}.$$

We fix $K>0$ and $\sigma\in(0,1/2)$ such that

$$K = e^{a\omega s_1} \quad (0<a<1), \qquad \max\left\{\frac{\lambda^*}{2\lambda^*+1},\frac{1}{2q}\right\} < \sigma < 1/2.$$

Moreover we fix $H\in(0,K)$ and $\varrho\in(0,1/2)$ such that

$$H = e^{a'\omega s_1} \quad (0<a'\ll a), \qquad \sigma<\varrho<1/2.$$

Here we do not give an explicit form of a'. The constant a' will be chosen sufficiently small in Section 5 - Section 8 to obtain the desired estimates. To apply a fixed point theorem, we define a suitable functional space. Let $c_{1\ell}>0$ be defined in Lemma A.1 and put $\epsilon_0 = c_{1\ell}/4$. Furthermore let $m_0 = m_0(q,n)$ be a constant given in (81). We define

$$\begin{cases} \varphi(y,s) < U_\infty(y) & \text{for } r<Ke^{-\omega s_1},\\ \left|\varphi(y,s) - U_\infty(y) + e^{-\lambda^* s}\phi_{1\ell}(y)\right| < \epsilon_0 e^{-\lambda^* s}e_1(\theta)\left(r^{-\gamma}+r^{2\lambda^*-m}\right) & \text{for } r\in(Ke^{-\omega s},e^{\sigma s}),\\ |\varphi(y,s)| < m_0U_\infty(y) & \text{for } r>e^{\sigma s}. \end{cases} \tag{46}$$

Then from Lemma A.1, we recall that $\phi_{1\ell}(y) = (1+o(1))c_{1\ell}e_1(\theta)r^{-\gamma}$ for $r \ll 1$. Hence if $\varphi(y,s)$ satisfies (46) for $s_1 < s < s_2$, then it holds that

$$-\frac{3e^{-\lambda^* s}}{2}c_{1\ell}e_1(\theta)r^{-\gamma} < \varphi(y,s) - U_\infty(y) < -\frac{e^{-\lambda^* s}}{2}c_{1\ell}e_1(\theta)r^{-\gamma} \tag{47}$$

for $r = Ke^{-\omega s}$ and $s_1 < s < s_2$. We will construct a solution $\varphi(y,s)$ of (12) which belongs to

$$A_{s_1,s_2} = \Big\{\varphi(y,s) \in C(\overline{\mathbb{R}^n_+} \times [s_1,s_2]); \varphi(y,s) \text{ satisfies (46) for } s \in (s_1,s_2)\Big\}.$$

For simplicity, we define $\Pi \subset \mathbb{N}^2$ by

$$\Pi = \{(i,j) \in \mathbb{N}^2;\ \lambda_{ij} < \lambda^*\}.$$

To construct such a solution, we define $\phi^*_\ell(y,s_1)$ by

$$\phi^*_\ell(y,s_1) = \begin{cases} e^{\lambda^* s_1}\left(U_\infty(y) - e^{m\omega s_1}U_\alpha(e^{\omega s_1}y) + \displaystyle\sum_{(i,j)\in\Pi} d_{ij}\phi_{ij}(y)\right) \\ \hfill \text{if } 0 \le r < He^{-\omega s_1}, \\ e^{\lambda^* s_1}\left(\Big(H+1-e^{\omega s_1}r\Big)\Big(U_\infty(y) - e^{m\omega s_1}U_\alpha(e^{\omega s_1}y) + \displaystyle\sum_{(i,j)\in\Pi} d_{ij}\phi_{ij}(y)\Big)\right. \\ \qquad \left. +\Big(e^{\omega s_1}r - H\Big)e^{-\lambda^* s_1}\phi_{1\ell}(y)\right) \quad \text{if } He^{-\omega s_1} < r < (H+1)e^{-\omega s_1}, \\ \phi_{1\ell}(y) \quad \text{if } (H+1)e^{-\omega s_1} < r < e^{\varrho s_1}, \\ e^{\lambda^* s_1}\left(\Big(r - e^{\varrho s_1}\Big)\Big(U_\infty(y) + \displaystyle\sum_{(i,j)\in\Pi} d_{ij}\phi_{ij}(y)\Big) + e^{-\lambda^* s_1}\Big(e^{\varrho s_1}+1-r\Big)\phi_{1\ell}(y)\right) \\ \hfill \text{if } e^{\varrho s_1} < r < e^{\varrho s_1}+1, \\ e^{\lambda^* s_1}\left(U_\infty(y) + \displaystyle\sum_{(i,j)\in\Pi} d_{ij}\phi_{ij}(y)\right) \quad \text{if } r > e^{\varrho s_1}+1. \end{cases}$$

Throughout this paper, we denote $\phi^*_\ell(y,s_1)$ by $\phi^*_\ell(y)$ for simplicity. We choose the initial data $\varphi(y,s_1)$ as

$$\varphi(y,s_1) - U_\infty(y) = \sum_{(i,j)\in\Pi} d_{ij}\phi_{ij}(y) - e^{-\lambda^* s_1}\phi^*_\ell(y).$$

Then by definition of ϕ^*_ℓ, we easily see that $\varphi(y,s_1) \in BC(\overline{\mathbb{R}^n_+})$. From now, we denote by $\varphi(y,s)$ a classical solution of (12) with the initial data $\varphi(y,s_1)$ and set

$$\Phi(y,s) = \varphi(y,s) - U_\infty(y), \qquad b(y,s) = \Phi(y,s)/\sigma(y).$$

Furthermore for simplicity of notations, we put

$$d_{\max} = \max_{(i,j)\in\Pi} |d_{ij}|.$$

5.1 Fixed point theorem

Since $e_1(\theta)$ is strictly positive on S^n_+ and $\lambda_{ij} < \lambda^*$ for $(i,j) \in \Pi$, from Lemma A.1, there exists $c_1 > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{(i,j)\in\Pi} |\phi_{ij}(y)| \leq c_1 e_1(\theta)\left(|y|^{-\gamma} + |y|^{2\lambda^*-m}\right) \qquad \text{for } y \in \mathbb{R}^n_+. \tag{48}$$

Here we fix $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_0/2c_1$. Let N be the number of elements of Π and define

$$U_{s_1,s_2} = \left\{d \in \mathbb{R}^N;\ |d| < \epsilon_1 e^{-\lambda^* s_1},\ \varphi(y,s) \in A_{s_1,s_2}\right\}.$$

For the case $U_{s_1,s_2} \neq \emptyset$, we define an operator P: $U_{s_1,s_2} \to \mathbb{R}^N$ by

$$P_{ij}(d;s_2) = (\varphi(s_2), \phi_{ij})_\rho \qquad \text{for } (i,j) \in \Pi. \tag{49}$$

By the continuous dependence on the initial data, we find U_{s_1,s_2} is a open set in $\mathbb{R}^N$. Furthermore by definition of U_{s_1,s_2}, it holds that $U_{s_1,s_2'} \subset U_{s_1,s_2}$ if $s_2 < s_2'$. Now we will see that $P_{ij}(d;s_2)$ can be defined on $\bar{U}_{s_1,s_2}$ and $P_{ij} \in C(\bar{U}_{s_1,s_2})$. In fact $\{d_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \subset U_{s_1,s_2}$ be a sequence converging to $d_* \in \partial U_{s_1,s_2}$. Let $\varphi_j(y,s)$ and $\varphi_*(y,s)$ be a solution corresponding to $d = d_j$ and $d = d_*$, respectively. Then since $\varphi_j(y,s) \in A_{s_1,s_2}$, by using Lemma 5.5, we easily see that for $s_1 < s < s_2$

$$\varphi_j(y,s) < \begin{cases} U_{\beta(s)} & \text{for } |y| < Ke^{-\omega s}, \\ U_\infty(y) - e^{-\lambda s}\phi_{1\ell}(y) + \epsilon_0 e^{-\lambda^* s} e_1(\theta)\left(r^{-\gamma} + r^{2\lambda^*-m}\right) & \text{for } Ke^{-\omega s} < |y| < e^{\sigma s}, \\ m_0 U_\infty(y) & \text{for } |y| > e^{\sigma s}. \end{cases} \tag{50}$$

Therefore by the continuous dependence on the initial data and the unique solvability of solutions, $\varphi_*(y,s)$ turns out to be defined on $s \in (s_1,s_2)$ and satisfies (50) with replaced '$<$' by '$\leq$'. As a consequence, $P_{ij}(d;s_2)$ can be defined for $d \in \partial U_{s_1,s_2}$. Furthermore we easily see that $P_{ij}(d;s_2) \in C(\bar{U}_{s_1,s_2})$. To apply a fixed point theorem, the following proposition plays a crucial role.

Proposition 5.1. *There exists $s_1 > 0$ such that if $P(d;s_2) = 0$ with $d \in \bar{U}_{s_1,s_2} \neq \emptyset$ for $s_2 > s_1$, then it holds that for $s_1 < s < s_2$*

$$\begin{cases} \varphi(y,s) < U_{\beta(s)}(y) & \text{for } r < Ke^{-\omega s_1}, \\ \left|\varphi(y,s) - U_\infty(y) + e^{-\lambda^* s}\phi_{1\ell}(y)\right| < \dfrac{\epsilon_0}{2} e^{-\lambda^* s} e_1(\theta)\left(r^{-\gamma} + r^{2\lambda^*-m}\right) & \text{for } r \in (Ke^{-\omega s}, e^{\sigma s}), \\ |\varphi(y,s)| < \left(\dfrac{1+3m_0}{4}\right) U_\infty(y) & \text{for } r > e^{\sigma s}, \end{cases}$$

where $\beta(s) = \beta_0 e^{m\omega s}$ and $\beta_0 > \alpha$ is a constant given in Lemma 5.5.

Proof. This proposition follows from Lemma 5.5, Proposition 6.1, Proposition 7.1 - 7.3 and Proposition 8.1 - 8.2. □

As a consequence, we obtain the following main result.

Proposition 5.2. *Let $s_1 > 0$ be as in* Proposition 5.1. *Then there exists $d^* \in \{d \in \mathbb{R}^N;\ |d| < \epsilon_1\}$ such that a solution $\varphi(y,s)$ corresponding to $d = d^*$ is defined on (s_1,∞) and satisfies $\varphi(y,s) \in A_{s_1,s_2}$ for any $s_2 > s_1$.*

To show the above proposition, we prepare several lemmas. Here we put

$$D_{s_1,s_2} = \{(d,s);\ d \in U_{s_1,s},\ s_1 < s < s_2\}, \qquad D_{s_1,s_2}[s] = \{d;\ (d,s) \in D_{s_1,s_2}\}.$$

Then it is clear that $D_{s_1,s_2}[s] = U_{s_1,s}$. Here we will see that D_{s_1,s_2} is a open set in $\mathbb{R}^N \times (s_1,s_2)$. In fact, let $(d,s) \in D_{s_1,s_2}$. Then by the continuous dependence on the initial data and by the continuity of solutions, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $(d-\delta, d+\delta) \times (s, s+\delta) \subset D_{s_1,s_2}$. Furthermore since $U_{s_1,s'} \subset U_{s_1,s}$ if $s' > s$, it holds that $(d-\delta, d+\delta) \times (s_1, s) \subset D_{s_1,s_2}$, which assures the claim. Let P be the operator defined by (49). Then P can be naturally considered as an operator $D_{s_1,s_2} \to \mathbb{R}^N$. We define its map by $(d,s) \longmapsto P(d,s)$. Then we find that $P : D_{s_1,s_2} \to \mathbb{R}^N$ is continuous. Furthermore by the same reason as above, P can be defined on $\bar{D}_{s_1,s_2}$ and $P \in C(\bar{D}_{s_1,s_2})$.

Lemma 5.1. *Let* $s_1 > 0$ *be given in* Proposition 5.1 *and* $U_{s_1,s_2} \neq \emptyset$. *Then* $P(d;\tau) = 0$ *has no solutions on* $\partial U_{s_1,\tau}$ *for any* $\tau \in [s_1, s_2]$.

Proof. Let $P(d_0;\tau) = 0$ and $\varphi(y,s)$ be a solution corresponding to $d = d_0$. Then from Proposition 5.1, we see that $\varphi(y,s)$ satisfies estimates given in Proposition 5.1 with replaced s_2 by τ. Hence if $|d' - d_0|$ is small enough, a solution corresponding to $d = d'$ belongs to $A_{s_1,\tau}$. Furthermore from Lemma 5.11, we note that $|d| < \epsilon_1$. Therefore it follows that $d_0 \in U_{s_1,\tau}$. Thus the proof is completed. ☐

Lemma 5.2. *Let* $s_1 > 0$ *be given in* Proposition 5.1. *Then if* $U_{s_1,s_2} \neq \emptyset$ *for some* $s_2 > s_1$, *then there exists* $d \in U_{s_1,s_2}$ *such that* $P(d; s_2) = 0$.

Proof. We recall that P: $\bar{D}_{s_1,s_2} \to \mathbb{R}^N$ is continuous and $P(d;\tau) = 0$ has no solutions on $\partial D_{s_1,s_2}[\tau]$ for any $\tau \in [s_1,s_2]$ (see Lemma 5.1). Then we can define $\deg(P(d;\tau), D_{s_1,s_2}[\tau], 0)$ for $\tau \in [s_1,s_2]$. By the homotopy invariance property (see Theorem 2.2.4 [16]), we get

$$\deg(P(d;s_2), D_{s_1,s_2}[s_2], 0) = \deg(P(d;s_1), D_{s_1,s_2}[s_1], 0).$$

Since $D_{s_1,s_2}[s] = U_{s_1,s}$, this implies $\deg(P(d;s_2), U_{s_1,s_2}, 0) = \deg(P(d;s_1), U_{s_1,s_1}, 0)$. Here we recall that $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_0/2c_1$, Then from Lemma 5.4 and Lemma 5.5, we find that $U_{s_1,s_1} = \{d \in \mathbb{R}^N;\ |d| < \epsilon_1 e^{-\lambda^* s_1}\}$. Furthermore by definition of $\varphi(y,s_1)$, it holds that for $(i,j) \in \Pi$

$$P_{ij}(d;s_1) = d_{ij} - (e^{-\lambda^* s_1}\phi^*_\ell, \phi_{ij})_\rho = d_{ij} - e^{-\lambda^* s_1}(\phi^*_\ell - \phi_{1\ell}, \phi_{ij})_\rho.$$

Then it follows from Lemma 5.9 that

$$|P_{ij}(d;s_1) - d_{ij}| \leq c e^{-(\lambda^*+\delta)s_1}.$$

This implies $|P(d;s_1) - \mathrm{Id}(d)| \leq c e^{-(\lambda^*+\delta)s_1}$. Hence by the homotopy invariance property (see Theorem 2.1.2 (2) [16]), we obtain

$$\deg(P(d;s_2), U_{s_1,s_2}, 0) = \deg(P(d;s_1), U_{s_1,s_1}, 0) = \deg(\mathrm{Id}, B_{\epsilon_1}, 0),$$

where $B_{\epsilon_1} = \{d \in \mathbb{R}^N;\ |d| < \epsilon_1\}$. Therefore there exists $d \in U_{s_1,s_2}$ such that $P(d;s_2) = 0$, which completes the proof. ☐

Lemma 5.3. *Let* $s_1 > 0$ *be given in* Proposition 5.1. *Then it holds that* $U_{s_1,s_2} \neq \emptyset$ *for any* $s_2 > s_1$.

Proof. Fix $s_2 > s_1$. Since $\varphi(y,s_1)$ satisfies estimates given in Lemma 5.4, by the continuous dependence on the initial data, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $U_{s_1,s_1+\delta} = \{d \in \mathbb{R}^N;\ |d| < \epsilon_1 e^{-\lambda^* s_1}\}$. Now we define

$$s^* = \sup\{s > s_1;\ U_{s_1,s} \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Suppose $s^* < s_2$. Then there exists a sequence $\{\tau_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \subset (s_1, s^*)$ such that $\tau_j \to s^*$ and $U_{s_1,\tau_j} \neq \emptyset$. By Lemma 5.2, there exists $d_j \in U_{s_1,\tau_j}$ such that $P(d_j, \tau_j) = 0$. Let $\varphi_j(y,s)$ be a solution corresponding to

$d = d_j$. Then from Proposition 5.1, $\varphi_j(y,s)$ satisfies estimates given in Proposition 5.1 with replaced s_2 by τ_j. Hence by a parabolic regularity theory, we see that $\varphi_j(y,s)$ converges to some function $\varphi^*(y,s)$ satisfying estimates given in Proposition 5.1 with replaced s_2 by s^* and with replaced '$<$' by '$\leq$'. Then by the continuity of $\varphi^*(y,s)$ in time, we find that there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\varphi^*(y,s) \in A_{s_1,s^*+\delta}$. However this contradicts the assumption, which completes the proof. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 5.2. Let $s_1 > 0$ be given in Proposition 5.1 and put $\tau_j = s_1 + j$. Then Lemma 5.3 implies $U_{s_1,\tau_j} \neq \emptyset$. Therefore from Lemma 5.2, there exists $d_j \in U_{s_1,\tau_j}$ such that $P(d_j;\tau_j) = 0$. We denote by $\varphi_j(y,s)$ a solution corresponding to $d = d_j$. Then from Proposition 5.1, there exist a limiting function $\varphi^*(y,s) \in C(\overline{\mathbb{R}^n_+} \times [s_1,\infty))$ and a subsequence $\{d_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ which is denoted by the same symbol such that $\varphi_j(y,s) \to \varphi^*(y,s)$ uniformly on any compact set in $\overline{\mathbb{R}^n_+} \times [s_1,\infty)$. Then this $\varphi^*(y,s)$ turns out to be the desired solution satisfying estimates given in Proposition 5.1 with replaced s_2 by ∞. Therefore the proof is completed. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let s_1 and $\varphi(y,s)$ be given in Proposition 5.2. Here we recall that $U_\beta(y) < U_\beta(0) = \beta$ for $y \in \mathbb{R}^n_+$. Therefore by Proposition 5.2, we see that

$$\varphi(y,s) < U_{\beta(s)}(y) \leq \beta(s) = \beta_0 e^{m\omega s} \quad \text{for } |y| < Ke^{-\omega s}.$$

Furthermore by using $|\phi_{1\ell}(y)| < c(|y|^{-\gamma} + |y|^{2\lambda^*-m})$ (see Lemma A.1) and $\lambda^* = (\gamma - m)\omega$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi(y,s) &\leq U_\infty(y) + ce^{-\lambda^* s}\left(|y|^{-\gamma} + |y|^{2\lambda^*-m}\right) \\ &\leq cK^{-m}e^{m\omega s} + c\begin{cases} K^{-\gamma}e^{m\omega s} & \text{for } Ke^{-\omega s} < |y| < 1, \\ e^{-\sigma m s}e^{-(1-2\sigma)\lambda^* s} & \text{for } 1 < |y| < e^{\sigma s}. \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

Finally we provide estimates in the range $|y| > e^{\sigma s}$. Then Proposition 5.2 implies

$$\varphi(y,s) \leq cr^{-m} \leq ce^{-m\sigma s} \quad \text{for } |y| > e^{\sigma s}.$$

As a consequence, we conclude

$$\|\varphi(s)\|_\infty \leq ce^{m\omega s}.$$

Furthermore from (47) and $\lambda^* = (\gamma - m)\omega$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|\varphi(s)\|_\infty &\geq \varphi(y,s)|_{|y|=Ke^{-\omega s}} \geq U_\infty(y) - ce^{-\lambda^* s}e_1(\theta)r^{-\gamma} \\ &\geq K^{-m}V(\theta)e^{m\omega s} - \frac{3}{2}K^{-\gamma}c_{1\ell}e_1(\theta)e^{m\omega s}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $K \gg 1$, from the above estimates, there exist $c_1 > 0$ and $c_2 > 0$ such that

$$c_1 e^{m\omega s} \leq \|\varphi(s)\|_\infty \leq c_2 e^{m\omega s},$$

which completes the proof. $\square$

5.2 Fundamental estimates

Lemma 5.4. *There exists a continuous function $\nu(s)$ on $\mathbb{R}_+$ satisfying $\lim_{s\to\infty}\nu(s) = 0$ such that if $|d| < \epsilon_1 e^{-\lambda^* s_1}$, then it holds that*

$$\begin{gathered}\Phi(y,s_1) = -U_\infty(y) + e^{m\omega s_1}U_\alpha(e^{\omega s_1}y) \quad \text{for } 0 < r < He^{-\omega s_1}, \\ \left|\Phi(y,s_1) + e^{-\lambda^* s_1}\phi_{1\ell}(y)\right| \leq \left(\nu(s_1)e^{-\lambda^* s_1} + c_1 d_{\max}\right)e_1(\theta)(r^{-\gamma} + r^{2\lambda^*-m}) \\ \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad \text{for } He^{-\omega s_1} < |y| < e^{\varrho s_1}, \\ -U_\infty(y) \leq \Phi(y,s) \leq ce^{-(1-2\varrho)\lambda^* s_1}U_\infty(y) \quad \text{for } r > e^{\varrho s_1}.\end{gathered}$$

Proof. The equality in $0 < r < He^{-\omega s_1}$ follows directly from definition of ϕ_ℓ^*. Next we provide the estimate in $He^{-\omega s_1} < r < e^{\varrho s_1}$. We recall that $U_\alpha(y) = U_\infty(y) - k_\alpha(1+o(1))e_1(\theta)r^{-\gamma}$ for $r \gg 1$ (see Theorem 3.1) and $\phi_{1\ell}(y) = c_{1\ell}e_1(\theta)r^{-\gamma}$ for $r \ll 1$ (see Lemma A.1). Therefore since $k_\alpha = c_{1\ell}$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-\lambda^* s_1}\phi_\ell^* &= (H+1-e^{\omega s_1}r)\left(k_\alpha(1+o(1))e^{-\lambda^* s_1}e_1(\theta)r^{-\gamma} + \sum_{(i,j)\in\Pi} d_{ij}\phi_{ij}\right) \\ &\quad +(e^{\omega s_1}r - H)c_{1\ell}(1+o(1))e^{-\lambda^* s_1}e_1(\theta)r^{-\gamma} \\ &= c_{1\ell}(1+o(1))e^{-\lambda^* s_1}e_1(\theta)r^{-\gamma} + (H+1-e^{\omega s_1}r)\left(\sum_{(i,j)\in\Pi} d_{ij}\phi_{ij}\right) \end{aligned}$$

for $He^{-\omega s_1} < r < (H+1)e^{-\omega s_1}$. Furthermore by definition of ϕ_ℓ^*, it follow that $e^{-\lambda^* s_1}\phi_\ell^* = e^{-\lambda^* s_1}\phi_{1\ell}$ for $(H+1)e^{-\omega s_1} < r < e^{\varrho s_1}$. Therefore since $\Phi(y,s_1) = \sum_{(i,j)\in\Pi} d_{ij}\phi_{ij} - e^{-\lambda^* s_1}\phi_\ell^*$, by using (48), we obtain the estimate in $He^{-\omega s_1} < r < e^{\varrho s_1}$. Finally we consider the region in $r > e^{\varrho s_1}$. Since $\varphi(y,s_1) = U_\infty + \sum_{(i,j)\in\Pi} d_{ij}\phi_{ij} - e^{-\lambda s_1}\phi_\ell^*$, we see that

$$\varphi(y,s_1) = (1-r+e^{\varrho s_1})\left(U_\infty + \sum_{(i,j)\in\Pi} d_{ij}\phi_{ij} - e^{-\lambda^* s_1}\phi_{1\ell}\right)$$

for $e^{\varrho s_1} < r < e^{\varrho s_1}+1$. Then since $\phi_{ij}(y) \sim r^{2\lambda_{ij}-m}$ for $r \gg 1$ (see Lemma A.1). we observe that $e^{-\lambda^* s_1}\sum_{(i,j)\in\Pi}(|\phi_{ij}| + |\phi_{1\ell}|) \le ce^{-(1-2\varrho)\lambda^* s_1}r^{-m}$ for $e^{\varrho s_1} < r < e^{\varrho s_1}+1$. Therefore since $0 < \varrho < 1/2$, we get if $|d| < \epsilon_1 e^{-\lambda^* s_1}$

$$0 \le \varphi(y,s_1) \le \left(1 + ce^{-(1-2\varrho)\lambda^* s_1}\right)U_\infty$$

for $e^{\varrho s_1} < r < e^{\varrho s_1}+1$. Furthermore by definition of ϕ_ℓ^*, we find $\varphi(y,s_1) = 0$ for $r > e^{\varrho s_1}+1$. Combining these estimates, we obtain the estimates in $r > e^{\varrho s_1}$, which completes the proof. ☐

Lemma 5.5. *There exist $\beta_0 > \alpha$ and $s_0 > 0$ such that if $s_1 > s_0$, $|d| < \epsilon_1 e^{-\lambda^* s_1}$ and $\varphi(y,s) \in A_{s_1,s_2}$, then it holds that for $s \in (s_1,s_2)$*

$$\varphi(y,s) \le U_{\beta(s)}(y) \quad \text{if } r < Ke^{-\omega s}$$

with $\beta(s) = \beta_0 e^{\omega s}$.

Proof. Since $\varphi(y,s) \in A_{s_1,s_2}$, we recall from (47) that

$$\varphi(y,s) \le U_\infty(y) - \frac{e^{-\lambda^* s_1}}{2}c_{1\ell}e_1(\theta)r^{-\gamma} \quad \text{for } |y| = Ke^{-\omega s},\ s_1 < s < s_2. \tag{51}$$

Furthermore since $e^{m\omega s_1}U_\alpha(e^{\omega s_1}y) = U_{\alpha_1}(y)$ with $\alpha_1 = \alpha e^{m\omega s_1}$ (see Theorem 3.1), Lemma 5.4 implies

$$\varphi(y,s_1) = U_{\alpha_1}(y) \quad \text{for } r < He^{-\omega s_1}$$

with $\alpha_1 = \alpha e^{m\omega s_1}$. Since $\phi_{1\ell}(y) = c_{1\ell}(1+o(1))e_1(\theta)r^{-\gamma}$ for $r \ll 1$ (see Lemma A.1), from Lemma 5.4, we see that $\varphi(y,s_1) \le U_\infty(y) + e^{-\lambda^* s_1}(-c_{1\ell} + o(1) + \nu(s_1) + c_1 d_{\max}e^{\lambda^* s_1})e_1(\theta)r^{-\gamma}$ for $He^{-\omega s_1} < r < Ke^{-\omega s_1}$. Then since $|d| < \epsilon_1 e^{-\lambda^* s_1}$ with $\epsilon_1 = c_{1\ell}/8c_1$, there exists $s_0 > 0$ such that if $s_1 > s_0$, then it holds that

$$\varphi(y,s) \le U_\infty(y) - \frac{e^{-\lambda^* s_1}}{2}c_{1\ell}e_1(\theta)r^{-\gamma} \quad \text{for } He^{-\omega s_1} < r < Ke^{-\omega s_1}.$$

We fix $\beta' > \alpha$ such that $k_{\beta'} < k_\alpha/2$ (see Theorem 3.1 (iv)). Then since $k_\alpha = c_{1\ell}$, there exists $s_0' > 0$ such that if $s > s_1 > s_0'$

$$e^{m\omega s}U_\beta(e^{\omega s}y) \ge U_\infty(y) - \frac{e^{-\lambda^* s}}{2}c_{1\ell}e_1(\theta)r^{-\gamma} \quad \text{for } r > He^{-\omega s}. \tag{52}$$

Put $\beta_1 = \beta' e^{m\omega s_1}$. Then from Theorem 3.1, we observe that $e^{m\omega s_1} U_\beta(e^{\omega s_1} y) = U_{\beta_1}(y)$. Since $\beta_1 > \alpha_1$, Theorem 3.1 implies $U_{\beta_1}(y) > U_{\alpha_1}(y)$ for $y \in \mathbb{R}^n_+$, which implies

$$\varphi(y, s_1) \le U_{\beta_1}(y) \quad \text{for } |y| < Ke^{-\omega s_1}. \tag{53}$$

Here we put $Z(y,s) = U_{\beta(s)}(y)$ with $\beta(s) = \beta' e^{m\omega s}$. From Theorem 3.1, we note that $\partial_s U_{\beta(s)}(y) \ge 0$ for $(y,s) \in \mathbb{R}^n_+ \times (s_1, \infty)$. Furthermore we put $\Lambda(\epsilon) = 1 + \epsilon$, then we get from Theorem 3.1

$$\partial_\epsilon U_{\Lambda(\epsilon)}(y) = \partial_\epsilon \left(\Lambda(\epsilon) U_1 \left(\Lambda(\epsilon)^{1/m} y \right) \right) = U_1 \left(\Lambda^{1/m} y \right) + \frac{\Lambda^{1/m}}{m} y \cdot (\nabla U_1) \left(\Lambda^{1/m} y \right).$$

Since $\partial_\epsilon U_{\Lambda(\epsilon)}(y) \ge 0$ for $y \in \mathbb{R}^n_+$, taking $\epsilon = 0$, we find

$$y \cdot \nabla U_1(y) + m U_1(y) \ge 0 \quad \text{for } y \in \mathbb{R}^n_+.$$

Since $U_\alpha(y) = \alpha U_1(\alpha^{1/m} y)$, $U_\alpha(y)$ also satisfies the above inequality for any $\alpha > 0$. Therefore it holds that

$$\begin{cases} Z_s - \Delta Z + \dfrac{y}{2} \cdot \nabla Z + \dfrac{m}{2} Z \ge 0 & \text{for } (y,s) \in \mathbb{R}^n_+ \times (s_1, \infty), \\ \partial_\nu Z = Z^q & \text{for } (y,s) \in \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+ \times (s_1, \infty). \end{cases}$$

Applying a comparison lemma in $\{(y,s);\ |y| < Ke^{-\omega s},\ s_1 < s < s_2\}$ with (51)-(53), we obtain the conclusion. ☐

Lemma 5.6. *There exists $c > 0$ such that if $|d| < \epsilon_1 e^{-\lambda^* s_1}$ and $\varphi(y,s) \in A_{s_1,s_2}$, then it holds that for $s_1 < s < s_2$*

$$|\Phi(y,s)| \le c \begin{cases} \min\left\{ r^{-m}, e^{-\lambda^* s} r^{-\gamma} \right\} & \text{if } r < Ke^{-\omega s}, \\ e^{-\lambda^* s} r^{-\gamma} & \text{if } Ke^{-\omega s} < r < 1, \\ e^{-\lambda^* s} r^{2\lambda^* - m} & \text{if } 1 < r < e^{\sigma s}, \\ r^{-m} & \text{if } r > e^{\sigma s}. \end{cases}$$

Proof. By definition of A_{s_1,s_2}, it is sufficient to show the estimate in $|y| < Ke^{-\omega s}$. Since $\Phi(y,s)$ satisfies (13) and $f(\Phi) > 0$, we observe that $\partial_s \Phi = \Delta \Phi - \frac{y}{2} \cdot \nabla \Phi - m\Phi$ in $\mathbb{R}^n_+ \times (s_1, \infty)$ and $\partial_\nu \Phi \ge K r^{-1} \Phi$ on $\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+ \times (s_1, \infty)$. To construct a sub-solution, we put

$$\zeta_\kappa(y,s) = -\kappa e^{-\lambda^* s} \phi_{1\ell}(y).$$

Then it is clear that $\zeta_\kappa(y,s)$ satisfies $\partial_s \zeta_\kappa = \Delta \zeta_\kappa - \frac{y}{2} \cdot \nabla \zeta_\kappa - m\zeta_\kappa$ in $\mathbb{R}^n_+ \times (s_1, \infty)$ and $\partial_\nu \zeta_\kappa = K r^{-1} \zeta_\kappa$ on $\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+ \times (s_1, \infty)$. Here we will apply a comparison argument in the parabolic cylinder $|y| < Ke^{-\omega s}$, $s > s_1$. Since $\varphi(y, s_1) = e^{m\omega s_1} U_\alpha(e^{\omega s_1} y)$ for $r < He^{-\omega s_1}$, by Theorem 3.1, there exists $r_0 > 0$ such that $\varphi(y, s_1) \ge U_\infty(y) - 2k_\alpha e^{-\lambda^* s_1} e_1(\theta) |y|^{-\gamma}$ for $e^{\omega s_1}|y| > r_0$. Furthermore from Lemma 5.4 with $|d| < \epsilon_1 e^{-\lambda^* s_1}$, it holds that $\Phi(y, s_1) > -(1 + \nu(s_1) + c_1 \epsilon_1) e^{-\lambda^* s_1} e_1(\theta) |y|^{-\gamma}$ for $He^{-\omega s_1} < |y| < Ke^{-\omega s_1}$. Therefore since $\phi_{1\ell}(y) = c_{1\ell}(1 + o(1)) e_1(\theta) |y|^{-\gamma}$ for $|y| \ll 1$ (see Lemma A.1), there exists $\kappa_0 > 0$ such that if $\kappa > \kappa_0$, then it holds that $\Phi(y, s_1) > \zeta_\kappa(y, s_1)$ for $r_0 e^{-\omega s_1} < |y| < Ke^{-\omega s_1}$. Furthermore by using $\phi_{1\ell}(y) = c_{1\ell}(1 + o(1)) e_1(\theta) |y|^{-\gamma}$ for $|y| \ll 1$ again, we get

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-\lambda^* s_1} \phi_{1\ell}(y) &\ge c_{1\ell}(1 + o(1)) e^{-\lambda^* s_1} e_1(\theta) |y|^{-\gamma} \\ &\ge c_{1\ell}(1 + o(1)) e^{-\lambda^* s_1} e_1(\theta) \left(r_0 e^{-\omega s_1} \right)^{-(\gamma - m)} |y|^{-m} \\ &= c_{1\ell} r_0^{-(\gamma - m)} (1 + o(1)) e_1(\theta) |y|^{-m} \qquad \text{for } |y| < r_0 e^{-\omega s_1}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence there exists $\kappa_1 > 0$ such that if $\kappa > \kappa_1$, then it holds that $\zeta_\kappa(y, s_1) < -U_\infty(y)$ for $|y| < r_0 e^{-\omega s_1}$. Therefore by the above argument, if $\kappa > \max\{\kappa_0, \kappa_1\}$, then it holds that

$$\Phi(y, s_1) > \zeta_\kappa(y, s_1) \quad \text{for } |y| < Ke^{-\omega s_1}.$$

Next we check boundary conditions on $|y| = Ke^{-\omega s}$ for $s \in [s_1, s_2]$. Since $\varphi(y,s) \in A_{s_1,s_2}$ and $\phi_{1\ell}(y) = c_{1\ell}(1+o(1))e_1(\theta)|y|^{-\gamma}$ for $|y| \ll 1$, there exists $\kappa_2 > 0$ such that if $\kappa > \kappa_2$, then it holds that

$$\Phi(y,s) \geq \zeta_\kappa(y,s) \quad \text{on } |y| = Ke^{-\omega s},\ s_1 < s < s_2.$$

Therefore since $\Phi(y,s), \zeta_\kappa(y,s) \in C([s_1,s_2]; H^1_\rho(B_1))$, a comparison lemma implies $\Phi(y,s) \geq \zeta_\kappa(y,s)$ for $|y| < Ke^{-\omega s}$ and $s_1 \leq s \leq s_2$ if $\kappa > \max\{\kappa_0, \kappa_1, \kappa_2\}$. Since $|\Phi(y,s)| < U_\infty(y,s)$ for $|y| < Kr^{-\omega s}$, we obtain the conclusion. ☐

As a consequence, a nonlinear term $f(\Phi(y,s))$ defined in (44) is estimated as follows.

Lemma 5.7. *There exists $c > 0$ such that if $|d| < \epsilon_1 e^{-\lambda^* s_1}$ and $\varphi(y,s) \in A_{s_1,s_2}$, then it holds that for $s_1 < s < s_2$*

$$|f(\Phi(y,s))| \leq c \begin{cases} \min\left\{r^{-(m+1)}, e^{-2\lambda^* s} r^{-1+m-2\gamma}\right\} & \text{if } r < Ke^{-\omega s}, \\ e^{-2\lambda^* s} r^{-1+m-2\gamma} & \text{if } Ke^{-\omega s} < r < 1, \\ e^{-2\lambda^* s} r^{-(m+1)+4\lambda^*} & \text{if } 1 < r < e^{\sigma s}, \\ r^{-(m+1)} & \text{if } r > e^{\sigma s}. \end{cases}$$

Proof. By using $f(\Phi) = (\Phi + U_\infty)^q - U_\infty^q - Kr^{-1}\Phi$ and $\Phi = \varphi - U_\infty$, we verify that

$$f(\Phi) = q(q-1)\left(\int_0^1\int_0^1 (\theta_1\theta_2\varphi + (1-\theta_1\theta_2)U_\infty)^{q-2}\,\theta_1 d\theta_1 d\theta_2\right)\Phi^2.$$

Since $\varphi(y,s)$ is positive, we get

$$f(\Phi) \leq q(q-1)\begin{cases} \left(\int_0^1\int_0^1 (1-\theta_1\theta_2)^{q-2}\theta_1 d\theta_1 d\theta_2\right) U_\infty^{q-2}\Phi^2 & \text{if } 1 < q < 2, \\ \left(\int_0^1\int_0^1 \theta_1 d\theta_1 d\theta_2\right)(\varphi + U_\infty)^{q-2}\Phi^2 & \text{if } q \geq 2. \end{cases}$$

Therefore Lemma 5.6 proves this lemma. ☐

Lemma 5.8. *Let $e^{\mathcal{B}s}$ be defined at the beginning of this section and $F(\xi') \in BC(\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+)$. Then it holds that*

$$\left(e^{\mathcal{B}s}F, \eta_{ij}\right)_{\mathcal{C}} = e^{-\lambda_{ij}s}(F, \eta_{ij})_{\mathcal{C},\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+} \quad \text{for } s > 0.$$

Furthermore it holds that

$$e^{\mathcal{B}(s+s')}F = e^{\mathcal{A}s}e^{\mathcal{B}s'}F \quad \text{for } s, s' > 0.$$

Proof. By using (38), we easily obtain the first formula. Furthermore by using

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \Gamma(y,\xi,s)\Gamma(\xi,z',s')\mathcal{B}(\xi)d\xi = \Gamma(y,z',s+s') \quad \text{for } z' \in \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+,\ s, s' > 0,$$

we obtain the the second formula. ☐

Lemma 5.9. *There exist $c > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ such that if $|d| < \epsilon_1 e^{-\lambda^* s_1}$, then it holds that*

$$\|\phi^*_\ell - \phi_{1\ell}\|_\rho \leq ce^{-\delta s_1}.$$

Proof. By definition of ϕ_ℓ^*, it is easily seen that

$$\|\phi_\ell^* - \phi_{1\ell}\|_\rho^2 \leq 2\left(\int_0^{(H+1)e^{-\omega s_1}} + \int_{e^{\varrho s_1}}^\infty\right)\left(\phi_\ell^*(y)^2 + \phi_{1\ell}(y)^2\right)\rho(y)dy.$$

Here from Theorem 3.1, we see that

$$|\phi_\ell^*(y)| < \begin{cases} U_\infty(y) + e^{\lambda s_1} d_{\max} \displaystyle\sum_{(i,j)\in\Pi} |\phi_{ij}(y)| \quad \text{for } |y| < He^{-\omega s_1}, \\ 2k_\alpha e_1(\theta)|y|^{-\gamma} + e^{\lambda s_1} d_{\max} \displaystyle\sum_{(i,j)\in\Pi} |\phi_{ij}(y)| + |\phi_{1\ell}(y)|, \\ \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad \text{for } He^{-\omega s_1} < |y| < (H+1)e^{-\omega s_1}. \\ e^{\lambda^* s_1}\left(U_\infty(y) + d_{\max} \displaystyle\sum_{(i,j)\in\Pi} |\phi_{ij}|\right) + |\phi_{1\ell}| \quad \text{for } |y| > e^{\varrho s_1}. \end{cases}$$

Therefore since $|\phi_{ij}(y)| < c_{ij}|y|^{-\gamma}$ for $|y| \ll 1$ (see Lemma A.1), by using $m < \gamma < (n-2)/2$ and $H > 1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{(H+1)e^{-\omega s_1}} \left(\phi_\ell^*(y)^2 + \phi_{1\ell}(y)^2\right)\rho(y)dy &\leq c\left(1 + e^{-2\lambda^* s_1} d_{\max}^2\right)\int_0^{2He^{-\omega s_1}} \left(|y|^{-2m} + |y|^{-2\gamma}\right)dy \\ &= c\left(1 + e^{-2\lambda^* s_1} d_{\max}^2\right) H^{n-2\gamma} e^{-(n-2\gamma)\omega s_1}. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore since $|\phi_{ij}(y)| < c_{ij}|y|^{2\lambda_{ij}-m}$ for $|y| \gg 1$ (see Lemma A.1), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{e^{\varrho s_1}}^\infty \left(\phi_\ell^*(y)^2 + \phi_{1\ell}(y)^2\right)\rho(y)dy &= c\int_{e^{\varrho s_1}}^\infty \left(e^{2\lambda^* s_1}|y|^{-2m} + |y|^{4\lambda^* - 2m}\right)\rho(y)dy \\ &\leq ce^{2\lambda^* s_1}\int_{e^{\varrho s_1}}^\infty |y|^{4\lambda^*-2m}\rho(y)dy \\ &= ce^{2\lambda^* s_1}\int_{e^{\varrho s_1}}^\infty r^{4\lambda^*-2m+n-1}e^{-r^2/4}dr. \end{aligned}$$

Since $r^{4\lambda^*-2m+n-1}e^{-r^2/4} \leq cre^{-r^2/8}$ for $r > 1$, it follows that

$$\int_{e^{\varrho s_1}}^\infty \left(\phi_\ell^*(y)^2 + \phi_{1\ell}(y)^2\right)\rho(y)dy \leq ce^{2\lambda^* s_1}\exp\left(-\frac{e^{2\varrho s_1}}{8}\right).$$

Therefore by definition of H, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi_\ell^* - \phi_{1\ell}\|_\rho^2 &\leq c\left(H^{n-2\gamma}e^{-(n-2\gamma)\omega s_1} + e^{2\lambda^* s_1}\exp\left(-\frac{e^{2\varrho s_1}}{8}\right)\right) \\ &\leq c\left(e^{-(n-2\gamma)(\omega - a')s_1} + e^{2\lambda^* s_1}\exp\left(-\frac{e^{2\varrho s_1}}{8}\right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $0 < a' \ll 1$, we obtain the conclusion. □

Lemma 5.10. *There exists $\delta > 0$ such that for any $(i,j) \in \mathbb{N}^2$ there exists $c_{ij} > 0$ such that if $\varphi(y,s) \in A_{s_1,s_2}$, then it holds that*

$$|(F(s), \eta_{ij})_{\mathcal{C},\partial\mathbb{R}_+^n}| \leq c_{ij}e^{-(\lambda^*+\delta)s} \quad \text{for } s_1 < s < s_2.$$

Proof. Since $H < K$, Lemma 5.7 implies

$$|F(\xi',\tau)| \le c\begin{cases} |\xi'|^{-m-1+\gamma} & \text{if } |\xi'| < He^{-\omega\tau}, \\ e^{-2\lambda^*\tau}|\xi'|^{-1+m-\gamma} & \text{if } He^{-\omega\tau} < |\xi'| < 1. \end{cases}$$

From Lemma A.1 and Lemma A.2, there exists $m_{ij} > 0$ such that $|\eta_{ij}(\xi)| < m_{ij}(1+|\xi|^{2\lambda_{ij}-m+\gamma})$ with $\lambda_{ij} \ge -(\gamma-m)/2$, Hence by using $|\mathcal{C}(\xi')| < c|\xi'|^{-2\gamma}\rho(\xi')$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+} F(\xi',s)\eta_{ij}\mathcal{C}\, d\xi' \le c_{ij} \Bigg(& \int_0^{He^{-\omega s}} |\xi'|^{-m-1-\gamma}d\xi' + e^{-2\lambda^* s}\int_{He^{-\omega s}}^1 |\xi'|^{-1+m-3\gamma}d\xi' \\ & + e^{-2\lambda^* s}\int_1^{e^{\sigma s}} |\xi'|^{-2m-1+4\lambda^*+2\lambda_{ij}}\rho(\xi')d\xi' + \int_{e^{\sigma s}}^\infty |\xi'|^{-2m-1+2\lambda_{ij}}\rho(\xi')d\xi' \Bigg). \end{aligned}$$

Put $2d = (n-2) - 2\gamma$. Then since $-1-2\gamma-d+(n-1) = d > 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+} F(\xi',s)\eta_{ij}\mathcal{C}\, d\xi' & \le c_{ij}(He^{-\omega s})^{-m-\gamma+n-2} + ce^{-2\lambda^* s}(He^{-\omega s})^{-(\gamma-m)+d} \\ & \quad \times \int_{He^{-\omega s}}^1 |\xi'|^{-1-2\gamma-d}d\xi' + c_{ij}e^{-2\lambda^* s} + c_{ij}e^{-2\lambda^* s}\int_{e^{\sigma s}}^\infty |\xi'|^{2\lambda^*/\sigma}|\xi'|^{-2m-1+2\lambda_{ij}}\rho(\xi')d\xi' \\ & \le c_{ij}\left(H^{n-2-(\gamma+m)}e^{-(n-2-2\gamma)\omega s}e^{-\lambda^* s} + H^{-(\gamma-m)+d}e^{-(\lambda^*+d\omega)s} + e^{-2\lambda^* s}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore since $H = e^{a's_1}$ with $0 < a' \ll 1$, we obtain the conclusion. ☐

Lemma 5.11. *There exist $\delta > 0$ and $c > 0$ such that if $\varphi(y,s) \in A_{s_1,s_2}$ and $(\Phi(y,s_2),\phi_{ij})_\rho = 0$ for any $(i,j) \in \Pi$, then it holds that*

$$d_{\max} < ce^{-(\lambda^*+\delta)s_1}.$$

Proof. From (45) and Lemma 5.8, we get for $(i,j) \in \Pi$

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= (e^{-A(s_2-s_1)}b_1,\eta_{ij})_{\mathcal{C}} + \int_{s_1}^s \left(e^{\mathcal{B}(s_2-\tau)}F(\tau),\eta_{ij}\right)_{\mathcal{C}} d\tau \\ &= e^{-\lambda_{ij}(s_2-s_1)}(b_1,\eta_{ij})_{\mathcal{C}} + \int_{s_1}^s e^{-\lambda_{ij}(s_2-\tau)}d\tau \int_{\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+} F(\xi',\tau)\eta_{ij}(\xi')\mathcal{C}(\xi')d\xi'. \end{aligned}$$

Here by definition of $\varphi(y,s_1)$, we see that

$$(b_1,\eta_{ij})_{\mathcal{C}} = (\Phi(s_1),\phi_{ij})_\rho = d_{ij} - e^{-\lambda^* s_1}(\phi^*_\ell,\phi_{ij})_\rho.$$

This implies for $(i,j) \in \Pi$

$$d_{ij} = -\int_{s_1}^s e^{\lambda_{ij}(\tau-s_1)}d\tau \int_{\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+} F(\xi',\tau)\eta_{ij}(\xi')\mathcal{C}(\xi')d\xi' + e^{-\lambda^* s_1}(\phi^*_\ell,\phi_{ij})_\rho.$$

Then from Lemma 5.10 and $\lambda^* > \lambda_{ij}$ for $(i,j) \in \Pi$, we obtain

$$\int_{s_1}^s e^{\lambda_{ij}(\tau-s)}d\tau \int_{\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+} |F\eta_{ij}|\mathcal{C}d\xi' \le ce^{-(\lambda^*+\delta)s_1}.$$

Next we estimate $(\phi^*_\ell,\phi_{ij})_\rho$. Since $(\phi_{1\ell},\phi_{ij})_\rho = 0$ for $(i,j) \in \Pi$, it holds that

$$(\phi^*_\ell,\phi_{ij})_\rho = (\phi^*_\ell - \phi_{1\ell},\phi_{ij})_\rho \quad \text{for } (i,j) \in \Pi.$$

Therefore Lemma 5.9 implies

$$|(\phi^*_\ell,\phi_{ij})_\rho| < ce^{-\delta s_1}.$$

Thus the proof is completed. ☐

We divide $b(y,s)$ several parts to estimate each term separately. By definition of $\Phi(y,s_1)$, $b(y,s)$ is rewritten by

$$\begin{aligned} b(y,s) &= e^{\mathcal{A}(s-s_1)}b_1 + \int_{s_1}^{s} e^{-\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)}F(\tau)d\tau, \\ &= -e^{-\lambda^* s}(\phi_\ell^*,\phi_{1\ell})_\rho \eta_{1\ell} + e^{-\mathcal{A}(s-s_1)}\left(b_1 + e^{-\lambda^* s_1}(\phi_\ell^*,\phi_{1\ell})_\rho\eta_{1\ell}\right) + S_2 \\ &= -e^{-\lambda^* s}\eta_{1\ell} + -e^{-\lambda^* s}(\phi_\ell^* - \phi_{1\ell},\phi_{1\ell})_\rho\eta_{1\ell} + S_1 + S_2. \end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

To provide estimates of S_i $(i=1,2)$, we consider three cases separately.

$$\begin{aligned} O_{\text{Short}} &= \left\{(y,s);\ Ke^{-\omega s} < r < e^{\sigma s},\ s_1 < s < s_1+1\right\}, \\ O_{\text{Long}} &= \left\{(y,s);\ Ke^{-\omega s} < r < e^{\sigma s},\ s > s_1+1\right\}, \\ O_{\text{Ext}} &= \left\{(y,s);\ r > Ke^{\sigma s},\ s > s_1\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

6 Short time estimates

In this section, we provide the estimate in

$$O_{\text{Short}} = \left\{(y,s);\ Ke^{-\omega s} < r < e^{\sigma s},\ s_1 < s < s_1+1\right\}.$$

Therefore throughout this section, we always assume $(y,s) \in O_{\text{Short}}$. Furthermore $|d| < \epsilon_1 e^{-\lambda^* s_1}$ and $\varphi(y,s) \in A_{s_1,s_2}$ are also assumed in this section. In this setting, $\Gamma(y,\xi,s)$ is dominated by $\Theta(y,\xi,s)$ as follows.

$$\Gamma(y,\xi,s-s_1) \le e^{(\gamma-m)/2}\Theta(y,\xi,s-s_1) \quad \text{for } s_1 < s < s_1+1. \tag{55}$$

Lemma 6.1. *Let $\nu(s)$ be given in Lemma 5.4. Then there exist $\delta > 0$ and $c > 0$ such that*

$$|S_1(y,s)| \le c\left(\left(\nu(s_1) + e^{-\delta s_1}\right)e^{-\lambda^* s} + d_{\max}\right)\left(1 + |y|^{2\lambda^* - m + \gamma}\right) \quad \text{in } O_{\text{Short}}.$$

Proof. For simplicity of notations, we put

$$X = \xi/\sqrt{1-e^{-(s-s_1)}}, \qquad Y = y/\sqrt{1-e^{-(s-s_1)}}, \qquad Z = e^{-(s-s_1)/2}y/\sqrt{1-e^{-(s-s_1)}}.$$

By definition of $\varphi(y,s_1)$, it is easily seen that

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= e^{\mathcal{A}(s-s_1)}\left(b_1 + e^{-\lambda^* s_1}(\phi_\ell^*,\phi_{1\ell})_\rho\eta_{1\ell}\right) \\ &= e^{\mathcal{A}(s-s_1)}\left(b_1 + e^{-\lambda^* s_1}\eta_{1\ell}\right) + e^{-\lambda^* s}(\phi_\ell^* - \phi_{1\ell},\phi_{1\ell})_\rho\eta_{1\ell}. \end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

Since $\eta_{ij}(y) = \phi_{ij}(y)/\sigma(y)$ $(\sigma(y) \sim |y|^{-\gamma})$ and $|\phi_{ij}(y)| < c(|y|^{-\gamma} + |y|^{2\lambda_{ij}-m})$, by using Lemma 5.9, we obtain

$$|(\phi_\ell^* - \phi_{1\ell},\phi_{1\ell})_\rho\eta_{1\ell}| \le ce^{-\delta s_1}\left(1 + |y|^{2\lambda_{ij}-m+\gamma}\right) \le ce^{-\delta s_1}\left(1 + |y|^{2\lambda^*-m+\gamma}\right).$$

Here we used $-(\gamma-m)/2 \le \lambda_{ij} < \lambda^*$ (see Lemma A.2). Therefore it is sufficient to estimate the first term on the right-hand side in (56), which is denoted by S_1'. For simplicity, here we denote $\Theta(y,\xi,s-s_1)$ by Θ. Since $b(y,s_1) + e^{-\lambda^* s_1}\eta_{1\ell} = (\Phi(y,s_1) + e^{-\lambda^* s_1}\phi_{ij})/\sigma(y)$, by Lemma 5.4, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} |S_1'| \le\ & c\int_0^{He^{-\omega s_1}} \Theta \cdot \left(|\xi|^{-m+\gamma} + e^{-\lambda^* s_1}\right)\mathcal{B}d\xi + c\left(\nu(s_1)e^{-\lambda^* s_1} + d_{\max}\right) \\ & \times \left(\int_{He^{-\omega s_1}}^{1} \Theta\cdot\mathcal{B}d\xi + \int_1^{e^{\varrho s_1}} \Theta\cdot|\xi|^{2\lambda^*-m+\gamma}\mathcal{B}d\xi\right) + c\int_{e^{\varrho s_1}}^{\infty} \Theta\cdot|\xi|^{-m+\gamma}\mathcal{B}d\xi \\ =:\ & cI_1 + c\left(\nu(s_1)e^{-\lambda^* s_1} + d_{\max}\right)(I_2 + I_3) + cI_4. \end{aligned}$$

First we provide the estimate of I_1. Since $|y| > Ke^{-\omega s}$, $s_1 < s < s_1 + 1$ and $H \ll K$, it holds that

$$|e^{-(s-s_1)/2}y - \xi| \geq c|y| \geq c(|y| + |\xi|) \quad \text{for } |\xi| < He^{-\omega s_1}.$$

Then we see that

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &\leq \frac{c\left((He^{-\omega s_1})^{\gamma-m} + e^{-\lambda^* s_1}\right)}{(1-e^{-(s-s_1)})^{n/2}} e^{-c|Y|^2} \int_0^{He^{-\omega s_1}} e^{-c|X|^2}\left(1+\frac{1}{|X|}\right)^{2\gamma} d\xi \\ &\leq \frac{cH^{\gamma-m}e^{-\lambda^* s_1}e^{-c|Y|^2}\left(He^{-\omega s_1}\right)}{(1-e^{-(s-s_1)})^{n/2}} \int_0^{He^{-\omega s_1}} e^{-c|X|^2}\left(1+\frac{1}{|X|}\right)^{2\gamma} |\xi|^{-1} d\xi \\ &\leq \frac{cH^{\gamma-m+1}e^{-\lambda^* s_1}e^{-\omega s_1}}{|y|}\left(|Y|e^{-c|Y|^2}\right)\int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+}\left(1+\frac{1}{|z|}\right)^{2\gamma}|z|^{-1}e^{-c|z|^2}dz. \end{aligned}$$

Since $|Y|e^{-c|Y|^2}$ is uniformly bounded on $|Y| > 0$, from $|y| > Ke^{-\omega s}$, it holds that

$$I_1 \leq c\left(\frac{H^{\gamma-m+1}}{K}\right)e^{-\lambda^* s_1}.$$

Next we estimate I_2. Since $b(y,s) = e^{\mathcal{A}_0(s-s_1)}b_0$ is a solution of $b_s = \frac{1}{\mathcal{C}}\nabla(\mathcal{C}\nabla b)$ in $\mathbb{R}^n_+ \times (s_1,\infty)$, $\partial_\nu b = 0$ on $\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+ \times (s_1,\infty)$ and $b(y,s_1) = b_0(y)$ in $\mathbb{R}^n_+$, we see that

$$I_2 = \int_{He^{-\omega s_1}}^1 \Theta\cdot\mathcal{B}d\xi \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+}\Theta\cdot\mathcal{B}d\xi = e^{\mathcal{A}_0(s-s_1)}1 = 1.$$

Furthermore to calculate I_3, we divide it into two parts.

$$I_3 = \left(\int_1^{\max\{1,2e^{-(s-s_1)/2}|y|\}} + \int_{\max\{1,2e^{-(s-s_1)/2}|y|\}}^{e^{\varrho s}}\right)\Theta\cdot|\xi|^{2\lambda^*-m+\gamma}\mathcal{B}d\xi =: I_3' + I_3''.$$

Then I_3' is estimated by

$$I_3' \leq \frac{c|y|^{2\lambda^*-m+\gamma}}{(1-e^{-(s-s_1)})^{n/2}}\int_1^{\max\{1,2e^{-(s-s_1)/2}|y|\}} e^{-c|Z|^2}d\xi \leq c|y|^{2\lambda^*-m+\gamma}.$$

Furthermore since $|e^{-(s-s_1)/2}y - \xi| \geq |\xi|/2$ for $|\xi| > \max\{1, 2e^{-(s-s_1)/2}|y|\}$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} I_3'' &\leq \frac{c}{(1-e^{-(s-s_1)})^{n/2}}\int_{\max\{1,2e^{-(s-s_1)/2}|y|\}}^{e^{\varrho s}}\left(1+|X|^{-1}\right)^{2\gamma}e^{-c|X|^2}|\xi|^{2\lambda^*-m+\gamma}d\xi \\ &\leq c\left(1-e^{-(s-s_1)}\right)^{(2\lambda^*-m+\gamma)/2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\left(1+\frac{1}{|z|}\right)^{2\gamma}e^{-c|z|^2}|z|^{2\lambda^*-m+\gamma}dz. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\lambda^* > 0$ and $\gamma > m$, we find that I_3'' is uniformly bounded. Finally we provide the estimate of I_4. Since $\sigma < \varrho$, it holds that $|e^{-(s-s_1)/2}y - \xi| > |\xi|/2$ for $|\xi| > e^{\varrho s_1}$. Therefore since $\gamma > m$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} I_4 &\leq c\int_{e^{\varrho s_1}}^\infty \frac{\left(1+|X|^{-1}\right)^{2\gamma}}{(1-e^{-(s-s_1)})^{n/2}}|\xi|^{-m+\gamma}e^{-c|X|^2}d\xi \\ &\leq c\left(1-e^{-(s-s_1)}\right)^{(\gamma-m)/2}\int_{e^{\varrho s_1}/\sqrt{1-e^{-(s-s_1)}}}^\infty |z|^{\gamma-m}e^{-c|z|^2}d\xi \\ &\leq c\int_{e^{\varrho s_1}}^\infty |z|^{\gamma-m}e^{-c|z|^2}d\xi. \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, by using $r^{\gamma-m+n-1}e^{-cr^2} \le cre^{-c'r^2}$ for $r > 1$, we obtain

$$I_4 \le c\int_{e^{\varrho s_1}}^{\infty} r^{\gamma-m}e^{-c'r^2}r^{n-1}dr = c\int_{e^{\varrho s_1}}^{\infty} re^{-c'r^2}dr = ce^{-c'e^{2\varrho s_1}}.$$

Combining the above estimates, we conclude

$$|S_1'| \le c\left(\left(\frac{H^{\gamma-m+1}}{K}\right)e^{-\lambda^* s_1} + \left(\nu(s_1)e^{-\lambda^* s_1} + d_{\max}\right)\left(1+|y|^{2\lambda^*-m+\gamma}\right) + e^{-ce^{-2\varrho s_1}}\right).$$

Here we recall that $H = e^{a's_1}$ and $K = e^{as_1}$ with $a' \ll a$. Therefore since $s_1 < s < s_1+1$, we obtain the conclusion. □

Here we consider a more general form of an integral instead of S_2 for a later argument.

$$T(y,s) = \int_{\mu_1}^{s} d\tau \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} \Gamma(y,\xi',s-\tau)F(\xi',\tau)d\xi',$$

where $\mu_1 \in (s_1,s_2)$. If we take $\mu_1 = s_1$, then $T(y,s)$ coincides with $S_2(y,s)$.

Lemma 6.2. *There exist $\delta > 0$ and $c > 0$ independent of μ_1 such that if $s_1 \le \mu_1 < s < \mu_1+1$, then it holds that*

$$|T(y,s)| \le ce^{-\delta s_1}e^{-\lambda^* s}\left(1+|y|^{2\lambda^*-m+\gamma}\right) \qquad \text{for } Ke^{-\omega s} < |y| < e^{\sigma s}.$$

Proof. We divide the integral of $T(y,s)$ into four parts.

$$\begin{aligned} T(y,s) &= \int_{\mu_1}^{s} d\tau \left(\int_0^{He^{-\omega\tau}} + \int_{He^{-\omega\tau}}^{1} + \int_1^{e^{\sigma\tau}} + \int_{e^{\sigma\tau}}^{\infty}\right)\Gamma(y,\xi',s-\tau)F(\xi',\tau)\mathcal{B}d\xi' \\ &=: I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + I_4. \end{aligned}$$

For simplicity of notations, we put

$$X' = \xi'/\sqrt{1-e^{-(s-\tau)}}, \qquad Y = y/\sqrt{1-e^{-(s-\tau)}}, \qquad Z = e^{-(s-\tau)/2}y/\sqrt{1-e^{-(s-\tau)}}.$$

Furthermore τ is always assumed to be $\mu_1 < \tau < s$. Then since $\mu_1 \le s \le \mu_1+1$, $\Gamma(y,\xi,s-\tau)$ is dominated by $\Theta(y,\xi,s-\tau)$ as (55). First we provide the estimate of I_1. In this case, since $H \ll K$, we find that

$$|e^{-(s-\tau)/2}y - \xi'| \ge c(|y| + |\xi'|).$$

Therefore we get from Lemma 5.7

$$I_1 \le c\int_{\mu_1}^{s} \frac{e^{-c|Y|^2}d\tau}{(1-e^{-(s-\tau)})^{n/2}} \int_0^{He^{-\omega\mu_1}} \left(1+|X'|^{-1}\right)^{2\gamma} e^{-c|X'|^2}|\xi'|^{-(m+1)+\gamma}d\xi'. \tag{57}$$

Then the space integral is estimated by

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^{He^{-\omega\mu_1}} \left(1+|X'|^{-1}\right)^{2\gamma} e^{-c|X'|^2}|\xi'|^{-(m+1)+\gamma}d\xi' \\ &\le \left(He^{-\omega\mu_1}\right)^{\gamma-m} \int_0^{He^{-\omega\mu_1}} \left(1+|X'|^{-1}\right)^{2\gamma} e^{-c|X'|^2}|\xi'|^{-1}d\xi' \\ &= cH^{\gamma-m}e^{-\lambda^*\mu_1}\left(1-e^{-(s-\tau)}\right)^{(n-2)/2} \int_0^{He^{-\omega\mu_1}/\sqrt{1-e^{-(s-\tau)}}} \left(1+\frac{1}{|z'|}\right)^{2\gamma} \frac{e^{-c|z'|^2}dz'}{|z'|}. \end{aligned}$$

Plugging this estimate into (57), we get

$$I_1 \leq cH^{\gamma-m}e^{-\lambda^*\mu_1}\int_{\mu_1}^{s}\frac{e^{-c|Y|^2}d\tau}{1-e^{-(s-\tau)}}\int_0^{He^{-\omega\mu_1}/\sqrt{1-e^{-(s-\tau)}}}\left(1+\frac{1}{|z'|}\right)^{2\gamma}\frac{e^{-c|z'|^2}dz'}{|z'|}.$$

Put $2d = (n-2)-2\gamma > 0$. Then it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 \leq cH^{\gamma-m}e^{-\lambda^*\mu_1}(He^{-\omega\mu_1})^d &\int_{\mu_1}^{s}\frac{e^{-c|Y|^2}d\tau}{(1-e^{-(s-\tau)})^{1+d/2}} \\ \times &\int_0^{He^{-\omega\mu_1}/\sqrt{1-e^{-(s-\tau)}}}\left(1+\frac{1}{|z'|}\right)^{2\gamma}\frac{e^{-c|z'|^2}dz'}{|z'|^{1+d}}. \end{aligned}$$

Here by changing variables as

$$|y|^2/(1-e^{-(s-\tau)}) = \mu \qquad \left(\mu^2 d\tau = e^{s-\tau}|y|^2 d\mu\right), \tag{58}$$

we see that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mu_1}^{s}\frac{e^{-c|Y|^2}d\tau}{(1-e^{-(s-\tau)})^{1+d/2}}\int_0^{He^{-\omega\mu_1}/\sqrt{1-e^{-(s-\tau)}}}\left(1+\frac{1}{|z'|}\right)^{2\gamma}\frac{e^{-c|z'|^2}dz'}{|z'|^{1+d}} \\ &\quad\leq e^{s-\mu_1}|y|^{-d}\int_{|y|^2/(1-e^{-(s-\mu_1)})}^{\infty}\frac{e^{-c\mu}d\mu}{\mu^{1-d/2}}\int_0^{He^{-\omega\mu_1}\sqrt{\mu}/|y|}\left(1+\frac{1}{|z'|}\right)^{2\gamma}\frac{e^{-c|z'|^2}dz'}{|z'|^{1+d}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $-2\gamma+n-2-d = d > 0$, we observe that

$$\int_0^{\infty}\frac{e^{-c\mu}d\mu}{\mu^{1-d/2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+}\left(1+\frac{1}{|z'|}\right)^{2\gamma}|z'|^{-1-d}e^{-c|z'|^2}dz' < \infty.$$

Therefore since $|y| > Ke^{-\omega s}$ and $\mu_1 < s < \mu_1+1$, by definition of H and K, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= cH^{\gamma-m+d}e^{s-\mu_1}e^{-\lambda^*\mu_1}e^{-d\omega\mu_1}|y|^{-d} \leq c\left(\frac{H^{\gamma-m+d}}{K^d}\right)e^{-\lambda^*\mu_1} \\ &= ce^{-(da-(\gamma-m+d)a')s_1}e^{-\lambda^*\mu_1}. \end{aligned}$$

Next we give the estate of I_2. Then we divide the integral of I_2 into two parts.

$$I_2 \leq \int_{\mu_1}^{s}d\tau\left(\int_{He^{-\omega\tau}}^{4|y|}+\int_{4|y|}^{1}\right)\Theta(y,\xi' s-\tau)|F(\xi',\tau)|d\xi' =: I_2' + I_2''.$$

From Lemma 5.7, we get

$$\begin{aligned} I_2' &\leq ce^{-2\lambda^*\mu_1}\int_{\mu_1}^{s}d\tau\int_{He^{-\omega\tau}}^{4|y|}\frac{\left(1+|X'|^{-1}\right)^{2\gamma}}{(1-e^{-(s-\tau)})^{n/2}}e^{-c|Z-X'|^2}|\xi'|^{-1+m-\gamma}d\xi' \\ &\leq ce^{-2\lambda^*\mu_1}\int_{\mu_1}^{s}(He^{-\omega\tau})^{-(\gamma-m)}d\tau\int_0^{4|y|}\frac{\left(1+|X'|^{-1}\right)^{2\gamma}}{(1-e^{-(s-\tau)})^{n/2}}e^{-c|Z-X'|^2}|\xi'|^{-1}d\xi' \\ &\leq cH^{-(\gamma-m)}e^{-\lambda^*\mu_1}\int_{\mu_1}^{s}\frac{d\tau}{1-e^{-(s-\tau)}}\int_0^{4|y|/\sqrt{1-e^{-(s-\tau)}}}\left(1+|z'|^{-1}\right)^{2\gamma}\frac{e^{-c|Z-z'|^2}dz'}{|z'|}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we put

$$Y_\mu = \sqrt{\mu}\left(1-\frac{|y|^2}{\mu}\right)^{1/2}\frac{y}{|y|}. \tag{59}$$

By changing variables as (58), we see that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mu_1}^{s} \frac{d\tau}{1-e^{-(s-\tau)}} \int_0^{4|y|/\sqrt{1-e^{-(s-\tau)}}} \left(1+|z'|^{-1}\right)^{2\gamma} e^{-c|Z-z'|^2} \frac{dz'}{|z'|} \\
&\qquad \le c \int_{|y|^2/(1-e^{-(s-\mu_1)})}^{\infty} \frac{d\mu}{\mu} \int_0^{4\sqrt{\mu}} \left(1+|z'|^{-1}\right)^{2\gamma} |z'|^{-1} e^{-c|Y_\mu-z'|^2} \frac{dz'}{|z'|}.
\end{aligned}
$$

We divide the above integral into two parts.

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int_{|y|^2/(1-e^{-(s-\mu_1)})}^{\infty} \frac{d\mu}{\mu} \int_0^{4\sqrt{\mu}} \left(1+|z'|^{-1}\right)^{2\gamma} |z'|^{-1} e^{-c|Y_\mu-z'|^2} \frac{dz'}{|z'|} \\
&\qquad = \left(\int_{\min\{|y|^2/(1-e^{-(s-\mu_1)}),1\}}^{1} + \int_{\max\{|y|^2/(1-e^{-(s-\mu_1)}),1\}}^{\infty} \right) \frac{d\mu}{\mu} \\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad \times \int_0^{4\sqrt{\mu}} \left(1+|z'|^{-1}\right)^{2\gamma} e^{-c|Y_\mu-z'|^2} \frac{dz'}{|z'|} \\
&\qquad =: A_1 + A_2.
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $-2\gamma+n-2>0$, we see that

$$
A_1 \le c \int_0^1 \frac{d\mu}{\mu} \int_0^{4\sqrt{\mu}} |z'|^{-(2\gamma+1)} dz' \le c \int_0^1 \mu^{-1+(-2\gamma+n-2)/2} d\mu \le c.
$$

To estimate A_2, we divide the space integral into two parts. Let

$$
\begin{aligned}
D_1 &= \left\{ |z'| < 4\sqrt{\mu};\ \left|Y_\mu - z'\right| > |Y_\mu|/2 \right\}, \\
D_2 &= \left\{ |z'| < 4\sqrt{\mu};\ \left|Y_\mu - z'\right| < |Y_\mu|/2 \right\}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{60}
$$

Furthermore we put

$$
A_2(D_i) = \int_{\max\{|y|^2/(1-e^{-(s-\mu_1)}),1\}}^{\infty} \frac{d\mu}{\mu} \int_{D_i} \left(1+|z'|^{-1}\right)^{2\gamma} |z'|^{-1} e^{-c|Y_\mu-z'|^2} dz'.
$$

Then it is clear that $A_2 \le A_2(D_1) + A_2(D_2)$. Here we note that $2|Y_\mu - z'| > |Y_\mu| > e^{-(s-\mu_1)/2}\sqrt{\mu}$ for $z' \in D_1$ and $\mu \ge |y|^2/(1-e^{-(s-\mu_1)})$. Therefore $A_2(D_1)$ is estimated by

$$
A_2(D_1) \le \int_1^{\infty} \exp\left(-ce^{-(s-\mu_1)}\mu\right) d\mu \int_0^{4\sqrt{\mu}} \left(1+|z'|^{-1}\right)^{2\gamma} |z'|^{-1} dz'.
$$

Since $-2\gamma+n-2>0$ and $\mu_1 < s < \mu_1+1$, we find that $A_2(D_1)$ is uniformly bounded. Next we estimate $A_2(D_2)$. Then it is easily verified that $|Y_\mu| < 2|z'|$ for $z' \in D_2$. Furthermore by definition of Y_μ, it holds that $|Y_\mu| > e^{-(s-\mu_1)/2}\sqrt{\mu}$ for $\mu \ge |y|^2/(1-e^{-(s-\mu_1)})$. Therefore it holds that

$$
D_2 \subset \left\{ z' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1};\ e^{-(s-\mu_1)/2}\sqrt{\mu}/2 < |z'| < 4\sqrt{\mu} \right\} \quad \text{for } \mu \ge \frac{|y|^2}{1-e^{-(s-\mu_1)}}. \tag{61}
$$

As a consequence, we see that

$$
\begin{aligned}
A_2(D_2) &\le \int_{\max\{|y|^2/(1-e^{-(s-\mu_1)}),1\}}^{\infty} \frac{d\mu}{\mu} \int_{e^{-(s-\mu_1)/2}\sqrt{\mu}/2}^{4\sqrt{\mu}} \left(1+|z'|^{-1}\right)^{2\gamma} |z'|^{-1} e^{-c|Y_\mu-z'|^2} dz' \\
&\le c \int_{\max\{|y|^2/(1-e^{-(s-\mu_1)}),1\}}^{\infty} \mu^{-1} \left(1+\mu^{-1}\right)^{\gamma} \mu^{-1/2} d\mu \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} e^{-c|Y_\mu-z'|^2} dz' \\
&\le c \int_1^{\infty} \mu^{-3/2} d\mu.
\end{aligned}
$$

Combining the above inequalities, we obtain

$$I_2' \le cH^{-(\gamma-m)}e^{-\lambda^*\mu_1}(A_2(D_1)+A_2(D_2) \le cH^{-(\gamma-m)}e^{-\lambda^*\mu_1}.$$

Next we provide the estimate of I_2''. Then it is easily verified that $|e^{-(s-\tau)/2}y-\xi'| \ge c(|y|+|\xi'|)$ for $|\xi'|>4|y|$. Then since $\mu_1<s<\mu_1+1$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} I_2'' &\le ce^{s-\mu_1}e^{-2\lambda^*\mu_1}\int_{\mu_1}^{s}\frac{e^{-c|Y|^2}d\tau}{(1-e^{-(s-\tau)})^{n/2}}\int_{4|y|}^{1}\left(1+|X'|^{-1}\right)^{2\gamma}\frac{e^{-c|X'|^2}dz'}{|\xi'|^{1-m+\gamma}}d\xi' \\ &\le ce^{-2\lambda^*\mu_1}\int_{\mu_1}^{s}\frac{e^{-c|Y|^2}d\tau}{(1-e^{-(s-\tau)})^{(2+\gamma-m)/2}}\int_{4|y|/\sqrt{1-e^{-(s-\tau)}}}^{\infty}\left(1+\frac{1}{|z'|}\right)^{2\gamma}\frac{e^{-c|z'|^2}dz'}{|z'|^{1-m+\gamma}}. \end{aligned}$$

By changing variables as (58), we get

$$I_2'' \le ce^{-2\lambda^*\mu_1}|y|^{-(\gamma-m)}\int_0^\infty\frac{e^{-c\mu}d\mu}{\mu^{1-(\gamma-m)/2}}\int_{4\sqrt{\mu}}^{\infty}\left(1+\frac{1}{|z'|}\right)^{2\gamma}\frac{e^{-c|z'|^2}dz'}{|z'|^{1-m+\gamma}}.$$

Here we change the order of integrals.

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^\infty\frac{e^{-c\mu}d\mu}{\mu^{1-(\gamma-m)/2}}\int_{4\sqrt{\mu}}^{\infty}\left(1+\frac{1}{r}\right)^{2\gamma}r^{m-\gamma+n-3}e^{-cr^2}dr \\ &\qquad = \int_0^\infty\left(1+\frac{1}{r}\right)^{2\gamma}r^{m-\gamma+n-3}e^{-cr^2}dr\int_0^{16r^2}\frac{e^{-c\mu}}{\mu^{1-(\gamma-m)/2}}d\mu \\ &\qquad \le c\int_0^\infty\left(1+\frac{1}{r}\right)^{2\gamma}r^{n-3}e^{-cr^2}dr. \end{aligned}$$

Since $-2\gamma+n-2>0$, the above integral is finite. Therefore since $|y|>Ke^{-\omega s}$ and $\mu_1<s<\mu_1+1$, we obtain

$$I_2'' \le ce^{-2\lambda^*\mu_1}|y|^{-(\gamma-m)} \le cK^{-(\gamma-m)}e^{-\lambda^*\mu_1}.$$

As a consequence, we conclude

$$I_2 \le c\left(H^{-(\gamma-m)}+K^{-(\gamma-m)}\right)e^{-\lambda^*\mu_1}.$$

Now we calculate I_3. We divide the integral into two parts.

$$\begin{aligned} I_3 &\le ce^{-2\lambda^*\mu_1}\int_{\mu_1}^{s}\frac{d\tau}{(1-e^{-(s-\tau)})^{n/2}}\left(\int_1^{\max\{4|y|,1\}}+\int_{4|y|}^{e^{\sigma\tau}}\right) \\ &\qquad\qquad \times\left(1+|X'|^{-1}\right)^{2\gamma}e^{-c|Z-X'|^2}|\xi'|^{4\lambda^*-m+\gamma-1}d\xi' \\ &= ce^{-2\lambda^* s_1}(A_1+A_2). \end{aligned}$$

In the first inequality, we applied Lemma 5.7. First we estimate A_1. Since $A_1=0$ if $4|y|<1$, we assume $4|y|>1$. Then by changing variables as in the estimate of I_2, we get

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &\le \int_{\mu_1}^{s}(1-e^{-(s-\tau)})^{(4\lambda^*-m+\gamma-2)/2}d\tau\int_0^{4|y|/\sqrt{1-e^{-(s-\tau)}}} \\ &\qquad\qquad \times\left(1+|z'|^{-1}\right)^{2\gamma}e^{-c|Z-z'|^2}|z'|^{4\lambda^*-m+\gamma-1}dz' \\ &\le c|y|^{4\lambda^*+\gamma-m}\int_{|y|^2/(1-e^{-(s-\mu_1)})}^{\infty}d\mu\int_0^{4\sqrt{\mu}}\frac{|z'|^{4\lambda^*-m+\gamma-1}}{\mu^{1+(4\lambda^*+\gamma-m)/2}}e^{-c|Y_\mu-z'|^2}dz', \end{aligned}$$

where Y_μ is given by (59). Since $4|y| > 1$, we note that $|y|^2/(1 - e^{-(s-\mu_1)}) > 1/16$. Therefore it holds that

$$A_1 \le c|y|^{4\lambda^*+\gamma-m} \int_{1/16}^{\infty} d\mu \int_0^{4\sqrt{\mu}} \frac{|z'|^{4\lambda^*-m+\gamma-1}}{\mu^{1+(4\lambda^*+\gamma-m)/2}} e^{-c|Y_\mu - z'|^2} dz'.$$

To estimate the above integral, we divide it into two parts.

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 \le\ & c|y|^{4\lambda^*+\gamma-m} \int_{1/16}^{\infty} d\mu \left(\int_{D_1} + \int_{D_2} \right) \frac{|z'|^{4\lambda^*-m+\gamma-1}}{\mu^{1+(4\lambda^*+\gamma-m)/2}} e^{-c|Y_\mu - z'|^2} dz' \\ =:\ & c|y|^{4\lambda^*+\gamma-m} (A_1(D_1) + A_1(D_2)), \end{aligned}$$

where D_1 and D_2 are given by (60). By the same calculation as in the estimate of I_2, we see that

$$A_1(D_1) \le \int_{1/16}^{\infty} e^{-c\mu} d\mu \int_0^{4\sqrt{\mu}} \frac{|z'|^{4\lambda^*-m+\gamma-1}}{\mu^{1+(4\lambda^*+\gamma-m)/2}} dz' = c \int_{1/16}^{\infty} \mu^{(n-4)/2} e^{-c\mu} d\mu.$$

On the other hand, by using (61), we verify that

$$A_1(D_2) \le c \int_{1/16}^{\infty} \mu^{-3/2} d\mu \int_{e^{-(s-\mu_1)/2}\sqrt{\mu}/2}^{4\sqrt{\mu}} e^{-c|Y_\mu - z'|^2} dz' \le c \int_{1/16}^{\infty} \mu^{-3/2} d\mu.$$

Therefore since $|y| < e^{\sigma s}$, we obtain

$$A_1 \le c|y|^{4\lambda^*+\gamma-m} \le c e^{2\sigma\lambda^* s} |y|^{2\lambda^*+\gamma-m}.$$

Next we provide the estimate of A_2. Here we note that $|e^{-(s-\tau)}y - \xi'| > c|\xi'|$ for $|\xi'| > 4|y|$. Therefore we see that

$$A_2 \le \int_{\mu_1}^{s} (1 - e^{-(s-\tau)})^{(4\lambda^*-m+\gamma-2)/2} d\tau \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \left(1 + |z'|^{-1}\right)^{2\gamma} e^{-c|z'|^2} |z'|^{4\lambda^*-m+\gamma-1} dz'.$$

Since $\gamma > m$ and $2\gamma < (n-2)$, A_2 turns out to be bounded. Thus since $\mu_1 < s < \mu_1 + 1$, we obtain

$$I_3 \le c e^{-2\lambda^*\mu_1} \left(e^{2\sigma\lambda^* s} |y|^{2\lambda^*-m+\gamma} + 1 \right) \le c e^{-(1-2\sigma)\lambda^*\mu_1} e^{-\lambda^*\mu_1} \left(|y|^{2\lambda^*-m+\gamma} + 1 \right).$$

Finally we provide the estimate of I_4. We consider two cases (i) $|y| < e^{\sigma s}/4$ and (ii) $|y| > e^{\sigma s}/4$ separately. For the case (i), it holds that $|e^{-(s-\mu_1)/2}y - \xi'| > c(|\xi'| + e^{\sigma\tau})$ for $|\xi'| > e^{\sigma\tau}$. Therefore by Lemma 5.7 and $\gamma > m$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} I_4 \le\ & \int_{\mu_1}^{s} \frac{\exp\left(-\dfrac{c e^{2\sigma\tau}}{(1 - e^{-(s-\tau)})} \right)}{(1 - e^{-(s-\tau)})^{n/2}} d\tau \int_{e^{\sigma\tau}}^{\infty} \left(1 + |X'|^{-1}\right)^{2\gamma} |\xi'|^{-m+\gamma-1} e^{-c|X'|^2} d\xi' \\ \le\ & c \int_{\mu_1}^{s} \frac{\exp\left(-\dfrac{c e^{2\sigma\tau}}{(1 - e^{-(s-\tau)})} \right)}{(1 - e^{-(s-\tau)})^{1-(\gamma-m)/2}} d\tau \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} |z'|^{-m+\gamma-1} e^{-c|z'|^2} dz' \\ \le\ & c \exp\left(-\frac{c e^{2\sigma\mu_1}}{(1 - e^{-(s-\mu_1)})} \right) \int_{\mu_1}^{s} \frac{d\tau}{(1 - e^{-(s-\tau)})^{1-(\gamma-m)/2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mu_1 < s < \mu_1 + 1$ and $\gamma > m$, it follows that

$$I_4 \le c e^{-c e^{-2\sigma\mu_1}}.$$

Next we consider the case (ii). Then I_4 is estimated by

$$\begin{aligned}
I_4 &\le \int_{\mu_1}^{s} \frac{d\tau}{(1-e^{-(s-\tau)})^{n/2}} \int_{e^{\sigma\tau}}^{\infty} \left(1+|X'|^{-1}\right)^{2\gamma} |\xi'|^{-m+\gamma-1} e^{-c|Z-X'|^2} d\xi' \\
&= \int_{\mu_1}^{s} \frac{d\tau}{(1-e^{-(s-\tau)})^{(m-\gamma+2)/2}} \int_{e^{\sigma\tau}/\sqrt{1-e^{-(s-\tau)}}}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-c|Z-z'|^2}dz'}{|z'|^{m-\gamma+1}} \\
&= \int_{\mu_1}^{s} \frac{d\tau}{(1-e^{-(s-\tau)})^{(m-\gamma+2)/2}} \left(\int_{e^{\sigma\tau}/\sqrt{1-e^{-(s-\tau)}}}^{4|y|/\sqrt{1-e^{-(s-\tau)}}} + \int_{4|y|/\sqrt{1-e^{-(s-\tau)}}}^{\infty} \right) \frac{e^{-c|Z-z'|^2}dz'}{|z'|^{m-\gamma+1}} \\
&=: I_4' + I_4''.
\end{aligned}$$

First we provide the estimate of I_4'.

$$\begin{aligned}
I_4' &\le c|y|^{\gamma-m} \int_{\mu_1}^{s} \frac{d\tau}{1-e^{-(s-\tau)}} \int_{e^{\sigma\tau}/\sqrt{1-e^{-(s-\tau)}}}^{4|y|/\sqrt{1-e^{-(s-\tau)}}} |z'|^{-1} e^{-c|Z-z'|^2} dz' \\
&\le c|y|^{\gamma-m} \int_{\mu_1}^{s} \frac{d\tau}{1-e^{-(s-\tau)}} \left(\frac{e^{\sigma\tau}}{\sqrt{1-e^{-(s-\tau)}}} \right)^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} e^{-c|Z-z'|^2} dz' \\
&\le ce^{-\sigma\mu_1}|y|^{\gamma-m} \int_{\mu_1}^{s} \frac{d\tau}{\sqrt{1-e^{-(s-\tau)}}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $|y| > e^{\sigma s}/4$, it holds that $e^{2\sigma\lambda^* s} \le 4^{2\lambda^*}|y|^{2\lambda^*-m+\gamma}$. Therefore we obtain

$$I_4' \le ce^{-(2\lambda^*+1)\sigma\mu_1}|y|^{2\lambda^*-m+\gamma}.$$

Furthermore since $|Z-z'| > c|z'|$ for $|z'| > 4|y|/\sqrt{1-e^{-(s-\mu_1)}}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
I_4'' &\le \int_{\mu_1}^{s} \frac{d\tau}{(1-e^{-(s-\tau)})^{(m-\gamma+2)/2}} \int_{4|y|/\sqrt{1-e^{-(s-\tau)}}}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-c|z'|^2}dz'}{|z'|^{m-\gamma+1}} \\
&\le c \int_{\mu_1}^{s} \frac{\left(\sqrt{1-e^{-(s-\tau)}}/|y|\right)^{2\lambda^*+1}}{(1-e^{-(s-\tau)})^{(m-\gamma+2)/2}} d\tau \int_{4|y|/\sqrt{1-e^{-(s-\tau)}}}^{\infty} |z'|^{2\lambda^*+1} \frac{e^{-c|z'|^2}dz'}{|z'|^{m-\gamma+1}} \\
&\le c|y|^{-(2\lambda^*+1)} \int_{\mu_1}^{s} \frac{d\tau}{(1-e^{-(s-\tau)})^{(m-\gamma-1-2\lambda^*)/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} |z'|^{2\lambda^*+\gamma-m} e^{-c|z'|^2} dz'.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $|y| > e^{\sigma s}/4$ and $\mu_1 < s < \mu_1 + 1$, we obtain

$$I_4'' \le ce^{-(2\lambda^*+1)\sigma s}.$$

As a consequence, since $\mu_1 < s < \mu_1 + 1$, we conclude

$$I_4 \le \left(e^{-(2\lambda^*+1)\sigma\mu_1} + e^{-ce^{-2\sigma\mu_1}} \right) \left(1 + |y|^{2\lambda^*-m+\gamma} \right).$$

By definition of σ, we note that $(2\lambda^*+1)\sigma > \lambda^*$. Thus combining the above estimates, we obtain the conclusion. $\square$

Therefore we obtain the desired estimate in O_{Short}.

Proposition 6.1. *Let $\nu(s)$ be given in Lemma 5.4. Then there exist $c > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ such that if $|d| < \epsilon_1 e^{-\lambda^* s_1}$ and $\varphi(y,s) \in A_{s_1,s_2}$, then it holds that*

$$\left|b(y,s) + e^{-\lambda^* s}\eta_{1\ell}(y)\right| = c\left(\nu(s_1) + d_{\max}e^{\lambda^* s_1} + e^{-\delta s_1}\right)e^{-\lambda^* s}\left(1 + |y|^{2\lambda^* - m + \gamma}\right)$$
$$\text{for } (y,s) \in O_{\text{Short}}.$$

Proof. Applying Lemma 5.9 and Lemma 6.1-Lemma 6.2 to each term in (54), we obtain the conclusion. □

7 Long time estimates

In this section, we provide the estimate in

$$O_{\text{Long}} = \left\{(y,s);\ Ke^{-\omega s} < |y| < e^{\sigma s},\ s_1 + 1 < s < s_2\right\}.$$

Throughout this section, we always assume

$$\varphi(y,s) \in A_{s_1,s_2}, \qquad (b(s_2), \eta_{ij})_{\mathcal{C}} = 0 \quad \text{for } (i,j) \in \Pi. \tag{62}$$

We recall that $b(y,s)$ is expressed by

$$b(s) = e^{\mathcal{A}(s-s_1)}b_1 + \int_{s_1}^{s} e^{\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)}F(\tau)d\tau. \tag{63}$$

From $(b(s_2), \eta_{ij})_{\mathcal{C}} = 0$ and (63), we easily see that

$$e^{-\lambda_{ij}(s_2-s_1)}(b_1,\eta_{ij})_{\mathcal{C}} + \int_{s_1}^{s_2}(e^{\mathcal{B}(s_2-\tau)}F(\tau),\eta_{ij})_{\mathcal{C}}d\tau = 0 \qquad \text{for } (i,j) \in \Pi.$$

Therefore by using $e^{\lambda_{ij}(s_2-s)}(e^{\mathcal{B}(s_2-\tau)}F(\tau),\eta_{ij})_{\mathcal{C}} = (e^{\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)}F(\tau),\eta_{ij})_{\mathcal{C}}$, (see Lemma 5.8), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
e^{\mathcal{A}(s-s_1)}b_1 &= e^{\mathcal{A}(s-s_1)}\left(b_1 - \sum_{(i,j)\in\Pi}(b_1,\eta_{ij})_{\mathcal{C}}\eta_{ij}\right) + \sum_{(i,j)\in\Pi} e^{-\lambda_{ij}(s-s_1)}(b_1,\eta_{ij})_{\mathcal{C}}\eta_{ij} \\
&= e^{\mathcal{A}(s-s_1)}\left(b_1 - \sum_{(i,j)\in\Pi}(b_1,\eta_{ij})_{\mathcal{C}}\eta_{ij}\right) - \sum_{(i,j)\in\Pi}\left(\int_{s_1}^{s_2}(e^{\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)}F(\tau),\eta_{ij})_{\mathcal{C}}d\tau\right)\eta_{ij}.
\end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, we obtain from (63)

$$\begin{aligned}
b(s) &= e^{\mathcal{A}(s-s_1)}\left(b_1 - \sum_{(i,j)\in\Pi}(b_1,\eta_{ij})_{\mathcal{C}}\eta_{ij}\right) + \int_{s_1}^{s} e^{\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)}F(\tau)d\tau \\
&\qquad - \sum_{(i,j)\in\Pi}\left(\int_{s_1}^{s_2}\left(e^{\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)}F(\tau),\eta_{ij}\right)_{\mathcal{C}}d\tau\right)\eta_{ij} \\
&= e^{\mathcal{A}(s-s_1)}\left(b_1 - \sum_{(i,j)\in\Pi}(b_1,\eta_{ij})_{\mathcal{C}}\eta_{ij}\right) - \sum_{(i,j)\in\Pi}\left(\int_{s}^{s_2}\left(e^{-\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)}F(\tau),\eta_{ij}\right)_{\mathcal{C}}d\tau\right)\eta_{ij} \\
&\quad + \left(\int_{s_1}^{s} e^{\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)}F(\tau)d\tau - \sum_{(i,j)\in\Pi}\left(\int_{s_1}^{s} e^{\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)}F(\tau)d\tau,\eta_{ij}\right)_{\mathcal{C}}\eta_{ij}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Here We put

$$\bar{\Pi} = \{(i,j) \in \mathbb{N}^2;\ \lambda_{ij} \le \lambda^*\}.$$

Furthermore we define

$$Pb = b - \sum_{(i,j)\in\bar{\Pi}} (b, \eta_{ij})_{\mathcal{C}} \eta_{ij}.$$

Then it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} b(s) = e^{\mathcal{A}(s-s_1)} P b_1 + e^{-\lambda^*(s-s_1)} (b_1, \eta_{1\ell})_{\mathcal{C}} \eta_{1\ell} - \sum_{(i,j)\in\Pi} \left(\int_s^{s_2} \left(e^{-\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)} F(\tau), \eta_{ij} \right)_{\mathcal{C}} d\tau \right) \eta_{ij} \\ + \left(\int_{s_1}^{s} \left(e^{-\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)} F(\tau), \eta_{1\ell} \right)_{\mathcal{C}} d\tau \right) \eta_{1\ell} + P \left(\int_{s_1}^{s} e^{\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)} F(\tau) d\tau \right). \end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

Lemma 7.1. *There exist $\delta > 0$ and $c > 0$ such that for $y \in \mathbb{R}^n_+$ and $s_1 < s < s_2$*

$$\left| e^{-\lambda^*(s-s_1)} (b_1, \eta_{1\ell})_{\mathcal{C}} \eta_{1\ell} + e^{-\lambda^* s} \eta_{1\ell} \right| < c e^{-\delta s_1} e^{-\lambda^* s} \left(1 + |y|^{2\lambda^* - m + \gamma} \right).$$

Proof. Since $\|\eta_{1\ell}\|_{\mathcal{C}} = 1$, we easily see that

$$e^{-\lambda^*(s-s_1)} (b_1, \eta_{1\ell})_{\mathcal{C}} \eta_{1\ell} + e^{-\lambda^* s} \eta_{1\ell} = e^{-\lambda^* s} \left(e^{\lambda^* s_1} b_1 + \eta_{1\ell}, \eta_{1\ell} \right)_{\mathcal{C}} \eta_{1\ell}.$$

Here we recall that $b_1(y) = \Phi(y, s_1)/\sigma(y) = \sum_{(i,j)\in\Pi} d_{ij} \eta_{ij} - e^{-\lambda^* s_1} \eta^*_\ell(y)$. Hence it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \left(e^{\lambda^* s_1} b_1 + \eta_{1\ell}, \eta_{1\ell} \right)_{\mathcal{C}} &= \left(e^{\lambda s_1} \left(\sum_{(i,j)\in\Pi} d_{ij} \eta_{ij} - e^{-\lambda^* s_1} \eta^*_\ell \right) + \eta_{1\ell}, \eta_{1\ell} \right)_{\mathcal{C}} \\ &= (-\phi^*_\ell + \phi_{1\ell}, \phi_{1\ell})_\rho. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore by Lemma 5.9, we obtain the conclusion. □

Lemma 7.2. *There exist $\delta > 0$ and $c > 0$ such that for $y \in \mathbb{R}^n_+$ and $s_1 < s < s_2$*

$$\left| \sum_{(i,j)\in\Pi} \left(\int_s^{s_2} \left(e^{-\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)} F(\tau), \eta_{ij} \right)_{\mathcal{C}} d\tau \right) \eta_{ij} \right| \le c e^{-(\lambda^*+\delta)s} \left(1 + |y|^{2\lambda^* - m + \gamma} \right).$$

Proof. From Lemma 5.8, we recall that

$$\left(e^{-\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)} F(\tau), \eta_{ij} \right)_{\mathcal{C}} = e^{-\lambda_{ij}(s-\tau)} \left(F(\tau), \eta_{ij} \right)_{\mathcal{C}, \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+}.$$

Then since $\varphi(y,s) \in A_{s_1,s_2}$ and $\lambda_{ij} < \lambda^*$ for $(i,j) \in \Pi$, we obtain from Lemma 5.10

$$\int_s^{s_2} e^{-\lambda_{ij}(s-\tau)} \left| (F(\tau), \eta_{ij})_{\mathcal{C}, \partial\mathbb{R}+^n} \right| d\tau \le c \int_s^{s_2} e^{-\lambda_{ij}(s-\tau)} e^{-(\lambda^*+\delta)\tau} d\tau \le c e^{-(\lambda^*+\delta)s}.$$

Furthermore since $-(\gamma - m)/2 \le \lambda_{ij} < \lambda^*$ for $(i,j) \in \Pi$, it holds that $|\eta_{ij}| < c(1 + |y|^{2\lambda_{ij} - m + \gamma}) < c(1 + |y|^{2\lambda^* - m + \gamma})$ for $(i,j) \in \Pi$. Therefore the proof is completed. □

Lemma 7.3. *There exist $\delta > 0$ and $c > 0$ such that for $y \in \mathbb{R}^n_+$ and $s_1 < s < s_2$*

$$\left| \left(\int_{s_1}^{s} \left(e^{-\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)} F(\tau), \eta_{1\ell} \right)_{\mathcal{C}} d\tau \right) \eta_{1\ell} \right| \le c e^{-\delta s_1} e^{-\lambda^* s} \left(1 + |y|^{2\lambda^* - m + \gamma} \right).$$

Proof. By the same way as in the proof of Lemma 7.2, we note that

$$\left(e^{-\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)}F(\tau),\eta_{1\ell}\right)_{\mathcal{C}}=e^{-\lambda_{1\ell}(s-\tau)}\left(F(\tau),\eta_{1\ell}\right)_{\mathcal{C},\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+}.$$

Then from Lemma 5.10, we see that

$$\left|\int_{s_1}^{s}e^{-\lambda^*(s-\tau)}(F(\tau),\eta_{1\ell})_{\mathcal{C},\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+}d\tau\right|\leq c\int_{s_1}^{s}e^{-\lambda^*(s-\tau)}e^{-(\lambda^*+\delta)\tau}d\tau\leq ce^{-\delta s_1}e^{-\lambda^*s}.$$

Therefore since $|\eta_{1\ell}|<c(1+|y|^{2\lambda^*-m+\gamma})$, we obtain the conclusion. □

To derive the estimates of $e^{\mathcal{A}(s-s_1)}Pb_1$ and $P(\int_{s_1}^{s}e^{\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)}F(\tau)d\tau)$ in (64), we divide O_{Long} into three parts.

$$\begin{aligned}O_{\text{Long}}^{(\text{I})}&=\left\{(y,s);\ Ke^{-\omega s}<|y|<e^{1/4},\ s_1+1<s<s_2\right\},\\O_{\text{Long}}^{(\text{II})}&=\left\{(y,s);\ e^{1/4}<|y|<\min\{e^{(s-s_1)/2},e^{\sigma s}\},\ s_1+1<s<s_2\right\},\\O_{\text{Long}}^{(\text{III})}&=\left\{(y,s);\ |y|>e^{(s-s_1)/2},\ s_1+1<s<s_2\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

7.1 Long time I

Here we provide the estimate in

$$O_{\text{Long}}^{(\text{I})}=\{(y,s);\ Ke^{-\omega s}<|y|<e^{1/4},\ s_1+1<s<s_2\}.$$

Lemma 7.4. *There exist $\delta>0$ and $c>0$ such that*

$$\|e^{\mathcal{A}(s-s_1)}Pb_1\|_{\mathcal{C}}\leq ce^{-(\lambda^*+\delta)s}.$$

Proof. Since $(Pb_1,\eta_{ij})_{\mathcal{C}}=0$ for $(i,j)\in\bar{\Pi}$, there exists $\delta>0$ such that

$$\|e^{\mathcal{A}(s-s_1)}Pb_1\|_{\mathcal{C}}\leq e^{-(\lambda^*+\delta)(s-s_1)}\|Pb_1\|_{\mathcal{C}}.$$

Here we recall that $b(y,s_1)=\Phi(y,s_1)/\sigma(y)$ and $\Phi(y,s_1)=\sum_{(i,j)\in\Pi}d_{ij}\phi_{ij}-e^{-\lambda^*s_1}\phi^*_\ell$. Then by definition of P, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned}Pb_1&=P\left(\sum_{(i,j)\in\Pi}d_{ij}\phi_{ij}-e^{-\lambda^*s_1}\phi^*_\ell\right)\\&=P\left(\sum_{(i,j)\in\Pi}d_{ij}\phi_{ij}-e^{-\lambda^*s_1}\phi_{1\ell}\right)+e^{-\lambda^*s_1}P\left(\phi_{1\ell}-\phi^*_\ell\right)\\&=e^{-\lambda^*s_1}P\left(\phi_{1\ell}-\phi^*_\ell\right).\end{aligned}$$

From Lemma (5.9), there exists $\delta_1>0$ such that $\|\phi^*_\ell-\phi_{1\ell}\|_{\mathcal{C}}<ce^{-\delta_1s_1}$. Therefore we obtain

$$\|Pb_1\|_{\mathcal{C}}\leq ce^{-(\lambda^*+\delta_1)s_1}.$$

Combining the above estimate, we obtain the conclusion. □

To estimate $Q(y,s)$, we prepare the trace inequality for axial symmetric functions.

Lemma 7.5. *There exists $c > 0$ independent of $r_1, r_2 \in [0, \infty]$ $(r_1 < r_2)$ and $g \in C(\mathbb{R})$ such that*

$$\int_{r_1}^{r_2} g(|\xi'|)|Q(\xi')|\mathcal{C}(\xi')d\xi' \le c \int_{r_1}^{r_2} g(|\xi|)\left(|\nabla Q(\xi)| + \frac{|Q(\xi)|}{|\xi|}\right)\mathcal{C}(\xi)d\xi$$

for any smooth axial symmetric function $Q(\xi) = Q(|\xi'|, \xi_n)$.

Proof. Let $q(\xi)$ be a smooth axial symmetric function and $\chi(\theta)$ be a cut off function such that $\chi(\theta) = 1$ if $\pi/4 < \theta < \pi/2$, $\chi(\theta) = 0$ if $0 < \theta < \pi/8$. Since $(\sin\theta) > \sin(\pi/8)$ for $\pi/8 < \theta < \pi/2$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{r_1}^{r_2} |q(r,\pi/2)|r^{n-2}dr &\le \int_{r_1}^{r_2} r^{n-2}dr \int_0^{\pi/2} \partial_\theta\Big(\chi(\theta)|q(r,\theta)|\Big)d\theta \\ &\le (1 + \|\chi_\theta\|_\infty)\int_{r_1}^{r_2} r^{n-2}dr \int_{\pi/8}^{\pi/2}\Big(|q(r,\theta)| + |q_\theta(r,\theta)|\Big)d\theta \\ &\le c\,(1 + \|\chi_\theta\|_\infty)\int_{r_1}^{r_2} r^{n-2}dr \int_{\pi/8}^{\pi/2}\Big(|q(r,\theta)| + |q_\theta(r,\theta)|\Big)(\sin\theta)^{n-2}d\theta.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore any smooth axial symmetric function $q(\xi)$ satisfies

$$\int_{r_1}^{r_2} |q(\xi')|d\xi' \le c\int_{r_1}^{r_2} \left(|\partial_\theta q(\xi)| + |q(\xi)|\right)|\xi|^{-1}d\xi,$$

where $c > 0$ is a constant independent of r_1, r_2 and $q(\xi)$. Here we recall that $c_1|\xi|^{-2\gamma}e^{-|\xi|/4} < \mathcal{C}(\xi) < c_2|\xi|^{-2\gamma}e^{-|\xi|/4}$. Therefore applying the above inequality with $q(\xi) = g(|\xi|)Q(\xi)|\xi|^{-2\gamma}e^{-|\xi|^2/4}$ and using $|\partial_\theta Q(\xi)| \le |\xi||\nabla Q(\xi)|$, we obtain the conclusion. ☐

Lemma 7.6. *There exist δ and $c > 0$ such that*

$$\left\|P\left(\int_{s_1}^{s} e^{\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)}F(\tau)d\tau\right)\right\|_{\mathcal{C}} \le ce^{-(\lambda^*+\delta)s}.$$

Proof. Let $Q(y,s) = P(\int_{s_1}^{s} e^{\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)}F(\tau)d\tau)$. By definition of $Q(y,s)$, we find that $Q(y,s)$ solves

$$\begin{cases} Q_s = \dfrac{1}{\mathcal{C}}\nabla(\mathcal{C}\nabla Q) + \left(\dfrac{\gamma - m}{2}\right)Q, & (y,s) \in \mathbb{R}^n_+ \times (s_1, \infty), \\ \partial_\nu Q = F, & (y,s) \in \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+ \times (s_1,\infty), \\ Q(y,s_1) = 0, & y \in \mathbb{R}^n_+. \end{cases}$$

Multiplying this equation by $Q(y,s)$ and integrating over $\mathbb{R}^n_+$, then we get

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{ds}\|Q\|^2_{\mathcal{C}} = -\|\nabla Q\|^2_{\mathcal{C}} + \int_{\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+} F(\xi',s)Q(\xi',s)\mathcal{C}(\xi')d\xi'. \tag{65}$$

Then since $H < K$, Lemma 5.7 implies

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+} |F(\xi',s)Q(\xi',s)|\mathcal{C}d\xi' &\le \int_0^{He^{-\omega s}} |\xi'|^{-(m+1)+\gamma}|Q|\mathcal{C}d\xi' + e^{-2\lambda^* s}\int_{He^{-\omega s}}^{1} |\xi'|^{-1+m-\gamma}|Q|\mathcal{C}d\xi' \\ &\quad + e^{-2\lambda^* s}\int_1^{e^{\sigma s}} |\xi'|^{-(m+1)+4\lambda^*+\gamma}|Q|\mathcal{C}d\xi' + \int_{e^{\sigma s}}^{\infty} |\xi'|^{-(m+1)+\gamma}|Q|\mathcal{C}d\xi' \\ &= J_1 + J_2 + J_3 + J_4.\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 7.5, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} J_1 &\le c\int_0^{He^{-\omega s}} |\xi|^{-(m+1)+\gamma}\left(|\nabla Q|+\frac{|Q|}{|\xi|}\right)\mathcal{C}d\xi \\ &\le c\left(\int_0^{He^{-\omega s}} r^{-2(m+1)+n-1}dr\right)^{1/2}\left(\|\nabla Q\|_{\mathcal{C}}+\left\|\frac{Q}{|\xi|}\right\|_{L^2_{\mathcal{C}}(B_1)}\right) \\ &= c(He^{-\omega s})^{(n-2-2m)/2}\left(\|\nabla Q\|_{\mathcal{C}}+\left\|\frac{Q}{|\xi|}\right\|_{L^2_{\mathcal{C}}(B_1)}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\lambda^*=\omega(\gamma-m)$, we find that $\omega(n-2-2m)=2\lambda^*+\omega(n-2-2\gamma)$. Therefore we obtain

$$J_1\le cH^{(n-2-2m)/2}e^{-(n-2-2\gamma)\omega s/2}e^{-\lambda^* s}\left(\|\nabla Q\|_{\mathcal{C}}+\left\|\frac{Q}{|\xi|}\right\|_{L^2_{\mathcal{C}}(B_1)}\right). \tag{66}$$

Next we estimate J_2. Then by the same way, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} J_2 &\le ce^{-2\lambda^* s}\int_{He^{-\omega s}}^1 |\xi|^{-1+m-\gamma}\left(|\nabla Q|+\frac{|Q|}{|\xi|}\right)\mathcal{C}d\xi \\ &\le ce^{-2\lambda^* s}\left(\int_{He^{-\omega s}}^1 |\xi|^{-2+2m-2\gamma}\mathcal{B}d\xi\right)^{1/2}\left(\|\nabla Q\|_{\mathcal{C}}+\left\|\frac{Q}{|\xi|}\right\|_{L^2_{\mathcal{C}}(B_1)}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Here we put $2d=(n-2)-2\gamma>0$. Then since $\mathcal{B}(\xi)\sim|\xi|^{-2\gamma}$, we observe that

$$\int_{He^{-\omega s}}^1 |\xi|^{-2+2m-2\gamma}\mathcal{B}d\xi\le\begin{cases}\left(He^{-\omega s}\right)^{-2(\gamma-m)+d}\displaystyle\int_{He^{-\omega s}}^1|\xi|^{-2-2\gamma-d}d\xi & \text{if } 2(\gamma-m)>d,\\ \displaystyle\int_{He^{-\omega s}}^1|\xi|^{-2-2\gamma-d}d\xi & \text{if } 2(\gamma-m)\le d.\end{cases}$$

Therefore since $-2-2\gamma-2d=d-n$, we obtain

$$J_2\le c\left(H^{-(\gamma-m)+d/2}e^{-d\omega s/2}e^{-\lambda^* s}+e^{-2\lambda^* s}\right)\left(\|\nabla Q\|_{\mathcal{C}}+\left\|\frac{Q}{|\xi|}\right\|_{L^2_{\mathcal{C}}(B_1)}\right). \tag{67}$$

Furthermore by the same calculation as above, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} J_3 &\le ce^{-2\lambda^* s}\int_1^{e^{\sigma s}}|\xi|^{-(m+1)+4\lambda^*+\gamma}\left(|\nabla Q|+\frac{|Q|}{|\xi|}\right)\mathcal{C}d\xi \\ &\le ce^{-2\lambda^* s}\int_1^{e^{\sigma s}}|\xi|^{-(m+1)+4\lambda^*+\gamma}\left(|\nabla Q|+|Q|\right)\mathcal{C}d\xi \\ &\le ce^{-2\lambda^* s}\left(\int_1^{e^{\sigma s}}r^{-2(m+1)+8\lambda^*+n-2}\rho(r)dr\right)^{1/2}\left(\|\nabla Q\|_{\mathcal{C}}+\|Q\|_{\mathcal{C}}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{68}$$

Finally repeating the above argument, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} J_4 &\le c\int_{e^{\sigma s}}^\infty|\xi|^{-(m+1)+\gamma}\left(|\nabla Q|+\frac{|Q|}{|\xi|}\right)\mathcal{C}d\xi \\ &\le c\left(\int_{e^{\sigma s}}^\infty r^{-2(m+1)}\rho(r)r^{n-1}dr\right)^{1/2}\left(\|\nabla Q\|_{\mathcal{C}}+\|Q\|_{\mathcal{C}}\right) \\ &\le ce^{-2\lambda^* s}\left(\int_{e^{\sigma s}}^\infty r^{-2(m+1)+4\lambda^*/\sigma}\rho(r)r^{n-1}dr\right)^{1/2}\left(\|\nabla Q\|_{\mathcal{C}}+\|Q\|_{\mathcal{C}}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{69}$$

As a consequence, since $H = e^{a's_1}$ with $0 < a' \ll 1$, by (66)-(69), there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+} |F(\xi', s)Q(\xi', s)|\mathcal{C}d\xi' \leq ce^{-(1+\delta)\lambda^* s}\left(\|\nabla Q\|_{\mathcal{C}} + \|Q\|_{\mathcal{C}} + \left\|\frac{Q}{|\xi|}\right\|_{L^2_{\mathcal{C}}(B_1)}\right).$$

Let $\chi(|\xi|)$ be a cut off function such that $\chi(r) = 1$ if $0 < r < 1$ and $\chi(r) = 0$ if $r > 2$. Here applying the Caffarelli-Kohn-Nirenberg inequality (32) with $m = \alpha = -2\gamma$, $r = p - 2$, $a = 1$, then we get

$$\left\|\frac{Q}{|\xi|}\right\|_{L^2_{\mathcal{B}}(B_1)} \leq \left\|\frac{\chi Q}{|\xi|}\right\|_{\mathcal{B}} \leq c\|\nabla(\chi Q)\|_{\mathcal{B}} \leq c\left(\|Q\|_{L^2_{\mathcal{B}}(B_2)} + \|\nabla Q\|_{L^2_{\mathcal{B}}(B_2)}\right).$$

Since $\mathcal{C}(\xi) = \rho(\xi)\mathcal{B}(\xi)$, we find $\|\cdot\|_{L^2_{\mathcal{C}}(B_1)} \leq \|\cdot\|_{L^2_{\mathcal{B}}(B_1)}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{L^2_{\mathcal{B}}(B_2)} \leq e\|\cdot\|_{L^2_{\mathcal{C}}(B_2)}$. Hence we obtain

$$\int_{\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+} |F(\xi', s)Q(\xi', s)|\mathcal{C}d\xi' \leq ce^{-(1+\delta)\lambda^* s}\left(\|\nabla Q\|_{\mathcal{C}} + \|Q\|_{\mathcal{C}}\right).$$

Therefore plugging this estimate into (65), we get

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{ds}\|Q(s)\|^2_{\mathcal{C}} \leq -\left(1 - e^{-\delta\lambda^* s}\right)\|\nabla Q(s)\|^2_{\mathcal{C}} + e^{-\delta\lambda^* s}\|Q(s)\|^2_{\mathcal{C}} + ce^{-(2+\delta)\lambda^* s}.$$

Since $(Q(s), \eta_{ij})_{\mathcal{C}} = 0$ for $(i,j) \in \bar{\Pi}$ and $Q(s_1) = 0$, there exists $\delta' > 0$ such that

$$\|Q(s)\|_{\mathcal{C}} \leq ce^{-(1+\delta')\lambda^* s},$$

which completes the proof. □

Lemma 7.7. *There exist $\delta > 0$ and $c > 0$ such that*

$$\left|e^{\mathcal{A}(s-s_1)}Pb_1\right| + \left|P\left(\int_{s_1}^{s} e^{\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)}F(\tau)d\tau\right)\right| < ce^{-\delta s_1}e^{-\lambda^* s} \quad \text{for } (y,s) \in O^{(\mathrm{I})}_{\mathrm{Long}}.$$

Proof. Since $|y| < e^{1/4}$ and $s > s_1 + 1$, we get from Lemma 4.11

$$\begin{aligned}\left|e^{\mathcal{A}(s-s_1)}Pb_1\right| &= \left|e^{\mathcal{A}/2}e^{\mathcal{A}(s-s_1-1/2)}Pb_1\right| = e^{(\gamma-m)/4}\left|e^{\mathcal{A}_0/2}e^{\mathcal{A}(s-s_1-1/2)}Pb_1\right| \\ &\leq c\left\|e^{\mathcal{A}(s-s_1-1/2)}Pb_1\right\|_{\mathcal{C}}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore Lemma 7.4 implies

$$\left|e^{\mathcal{A}(s-s_1)}Pb_1\right| \leq ce^{-(\lambda^*+\delta)s}.$$

Next we estimate $P(\int_{s_1}^{s} e^{\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)}F(\tau)d\tau)$. We divide the integral into two parts.

$$P\left(\int_{s_1}^{s} e^{\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)}F(\tau)d\tau\right) = P\left(\int_{s_1}^{s-1} e^{\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)}F(\tau)d\tau\right) + P\left(\int_{s-1}^{s} e^{\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)}F(\tau)d\tau\right).$$

From Lemma 5.8, we recall that $e^{\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)}F(\tau) = e^{\mathcal{A}/2}e^{\mathcal{B}(s-\tau-1/2)}F(\tau)$ for $s_1 < \tau < s - 1$. Hence by the same way as above, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\left|P\left(\int_{s_1}^{s-1} e^{\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)}F(\tau)d\tau\right)\right| &= \left|e^{\mathcal{A}/2}P\left(\int_{s_1}^{s-1} e^{\mathcal{B}(s-\tau-1/2)}F(\tau)d\tau\right)\right| \\ &\leq c\left\|P\left(\int_{s_1}^{s-1} e^{\mathcal{B}(s-\tau-1/2)}F(\tau)d\tau\right)\right\|_{\mathcal{C}}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore by Lemma 7.6, it follows that

$$\left|P\left(\int_{s_1}^{s-1} e^{\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)}F(\tau)d\tau\right)\right| \le ce^{-(\lambda^*+\delta)s}.$$

Now we estimate $P(\int_{s-1}^{s} e^{\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)}F(\tau)d\tau)$. Then by Lemma 6.2, we see that

$$\left|\int_{s-1}^{s} e^{\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)}F(\tau)d\tau\right| \le ce^{-\delta s_1}e^{-\lambda^* s} \quad \text{for } Ke^{-\omega s} < |y| < e^{\sigma s}.$$

Furthermore Lemma 5.8 and Lemma 5.10 imply

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\left(\int_{s-1}^{s} e^{\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)}F(\tau)d\tau, \eta_{ij}\right)_{\mathcal{C}}\right| &= \left|\int_{s-1}^{s} e^{-\lambda_{ij}(s-\tau)}\left(F(\tau),\eta_{ij}\right)_{\mathcal{C},\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+}d\tau\right| \\ &\le c\int_{s-1}^{s} e^{-\lambda_{ij}(s-\tau)}e^{-(\lambda^*+\delta)s}d\tau \le ce^{-(\lambda^*+\delta)s}.\end{aligned}$$

Here we recall that $Pb = b - \sum_{(i,j)\in\bar{\Pi}}(b,\eta_{ij})_{\mathcal{C}}\eta_{ij}$. Therefore since $|y| < e^{1/4}$, we obtain

$$\left|P\left(\int_{s-1}^{s} e^{\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)}F(\tau)d\tau\right)\right| \le ce^{-\delta s_1}e^{-\lambda^* s}.$$

Thus the proof is completed. □

Therefore combining Lemma 7.1 - Lemma 7.3 and Lemma 7.7, we obtain the following result.

Proposition 7.1. *There exist $\delta > 0$ and $c > 0$ such that if $\varphi(y,s)$ satisfies* (62)*, then it holds that*

$$\left|b(y,s) + e^{-\lambda^* s}\eta_{1\ell}(y)\right| \le ce^{-\delta s_1}e^{-\lambda^* s}\left(1 + |y|^{2\lambda^*-m+\gamma}\right) \quad \text{for } (y,s)\in O^{(\mathrm{I})}_{\mathrm{Long}}.$$

7.2 Long time II

In this subsection, we derive the estimate in

$$O^{(\mathrm{II})}_{\mathrm{Long}} = \{(y,s);\ e^{1/4} < |y| < \min\{e^{(s-s_1)/2}, e^{\sigma s}\},\ s_1+1 < s < s_2\}.$$

Throughout this section, we always assume $(y,s)\in O^{(\mathrm{II})}_{\mathrm{Long}}$ and (62). Since $e^{1/4} < |y| < e^{(s-s_1)/2}$, we can fix $s'\in(s_1,s)$ such that

$$|y| = e^{(s-s')/2}. \tag{70}$$

Furthermore since $e^{(s-s')/2} = |y| > e^{1/4}$, it follows that

$$1 - e^{-(s-s')} > \left(\sqrt{2}-1\right)/\sqrt{2}. \tag{71}$$

For simplicity of notations, s' always stands for (70) in this subsection.

Lemma 7.8. *There exist $\delta > 0$ and $c > 0$ such that*

$$|e^{\mathcal{A}(s-s_1)}Pb_1| \le ce^{-\delta s_1}e^{-\lambda^* s} \quad \text{for } (y,s)\in O^{(\mathrm{II})}_{\mathrm{Long}}.$$

Proof. Since $|y| = e^{(s-s')/2}$, applying Lemma 4.11, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}\left|e^{\mathcal{A}(s-s')}\left(e^{\mathcal{A}(s'-s_1)}Pb_1\right)\right| &= e^{(\gamma-m)(s-s')/2}\left|e^{\mathcal{A}_0(s-s')}\left(e^{\mathcal{A}(s'-s_1)}Pb_1\right)\right| \\ &\le \frac{ce^{(\gamma-m)(s-s')/2}}{(1-e^{-(s-s')})^n}\left\|e^{\mathcal{A}(s'-s_1)}Pb_1\right\|_{\mathcal{C}}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore we obtain from (70) and (71)

$$\begin{aligned}\left|e^{\mathcal{A}(s-s')}\left(e^{\mathcal{A}(s'-s_1)}Pb_1\right)\right| &< ce^{(\gamma-m)(s-s')/2}e^{-\lambda^*(s'-s_1)}\|Pb_1\|_{\mathcal{C}} \\ &= ce^{(\gamma-m)(s-s')/2}e^{\lambda^*(s-s')}e^{-\lambda^* s}e^{\lambda^* s_1}\|Pb_1\|_{\mathcal{C}} \\ &= ce^{-\lambda^* s}e^{\lambda^* s_1}\|Pb_1\|_{\mathcal{C}}|y|^{2\lambda^*-m+\gamma}.\end{aligned}$$

Here we recall that $\|Pb_1\|_{\mathcal{C}} < ce^{-(\lambda^*+\delta)s_1}$ (see proof of Lemma 7.4). Therefore we obtain the conclusion. □

Lemma 7.9. *There exist $\delta > 0$ and $c > 0$ such that*

$$\left|P\left(\int_{s_1}^{s} e^{\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)}F(\tau)d\tau\right)\right| < ce^{-\delta s_1}e^{-\lambda^* s} \quad \text{for } (y,s) \in O_{\text{Long}}^{(\text{II})}.$$

Proof. By using $Pb = b - \sum_{(i,j)\in\bar{\Pi}}(b,\eta_{ij})_{\mathcal{C}}\eta_{ij}$, we divide the integral into four parts.

$$\begin{aligned}P\left(\int_{s_1}^{s} e^{\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)}F(\tau)d\tau\right) &= P\left(\int_{s_1}^{s'} e^{\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)}F(\tau)d\tau\right) + \left(\int_{s'}^{s-1} + \int_{s-1}^{s}\right)e^{\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)}F(\tau)d\tau \\ &\quad - \sum_{(i,j)\in\bar{\Pi}}\left(\int_{s'}^{s}(e^{\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)}F(\tau),\eta_{ij})_{\mathcal{C}}d\tau\right)\eta_{ij}.\end{aligned} \tag{72}$$

Since $e^{\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)} = e^{\mathcal{A}(s-s')}e^{\mathcal{B}(s'-\tau)}$ for $\tau < s' < s$ (see Lemma 5.8), the first integral of (72) is written by

$$P\left(\int_{s_1}^{s'} e^{\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)}F(\tau)d\tau\right) = e^{\mathcal{A}(s-s')}P\left(\int_{s_1}^{s'} e^{\mathcal{B}(s'-\tau)}F(\tau)d\tau\right).$$

Then since $e^{\mathcal{A}(s-s')} = e^{(\gamma-m)(s-s')/2}e^{\mathcal{A}_0(s-s')}$, by using $|y| = e^{(s-s')/2}$, we get from Lemma 4.11,

$$\begin{aligned}\left|e^{\mathcal{A}(s-s')}P\left(\int_{s_1}^{s'} e^{\mathcal{B}(s'-\tau)}F(\tau)d\tau\right)\right| &< \frac{ce^{(\gamma-m)(s-s')/2}}{(1-e^{-(s-s')})^n}\left\|P\left(\int_{s_1}^{s'} e^{\mathcal{B}(s'-\tau)}F(\tau)d\tau\right)\right\|_{\mathcal{C}} \\ &= \frac{c|y|^{\gamma-m}}{(1-e^{-(s-s')})^n}\left\|P\left(\int_{s_1}^{s'} e^{\mathcal{B}(s'-\tau)}F(\tau)d\tau\right)\right\|_{\mathcal{C}}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore by using Lemma 7.6, (70) and (71), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\left|e^{\mathcal{A}(s-s')}P\left(\int_{s_1}^{s'} e^{\mathcal{B}(s'-\tau)}F(\tau)d\tau\right)\right| &\le ce^{-(\lambda^*+\delta)s'}|y|^{\gamma-m} = e^{-\delta s'}e^{-\lambda^* s}ce^{\lambda^*(s-s')}|y|^{\gamma-m} \\ &= ce^{-\delta s'}e^{-\lambda^* s}|y|^{2\lambda^*-m+\gamma}.\end{aligned}$$

Next we estimate the second integral of (72). Since $|y| = e^{(s-s')/2}$, we obtain from Lemma 7.11

$$\left|\int_{s'}^{s-1} e^{\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)}F(\tau)d\tau\right| \le ce^{-\delta s_1}e^{-\lambda^* s}\left(1 + |y|^{2\lambda^*-m+\gamma}\right).$$

To estimate the third term in (72), we apply Lemma 6.2 and obtain

$$\left|\int_{s-1}^{s} e^{\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)}F(\tau)\right| \le ce^{-\lambda^* s}e^{-\delta s_1}\left(1+|y|^{2\lambda^*-m+\gamma}\right) \qquad \text{for } Ke^{-\omega s} < |y| < e^{\sigma s}.$$

Finally we provide the estimate of the last term in (72). Then since $\lambda_{ij} \le \lambda^*$ for $(i,j) \in \bar{\Pi}$, from Lemma 5.8 and Lemma 5.10, we get

$$\left|\left(\int_{s'}^{s} (e^{\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)}F(\tau), \eta_{ij})_{\mathcal{C}} d\tau\right)\right| = \left|\left(\int_{s'}^{s} e^{-\lambda_{ij}(s-\tau)}(F(\tau), \eta_{ij})_{\mathcal{C},\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+} d\tau\right)\right|$$

$$\le c\left(\int_{s'}^{s} e^{-\lambda_{ij}(s-\tau)}e^{-(\lambda^*+\delta)\tau}d\tau\right) \le ce^{-\lambda_{ij}(s-s')}e^{-(\lambda^*+\delta)s'} \qquad \text{for } (i,j) \in \bar{\Pi}.$$

From Lemma A.1, we recall that $|\eta_{ij}| < c|y|^{2\lambda_{ij}-m+\gamma}$ for $|y| > e^{1/4}$. Therefore by using $|y| = e^{(s-s')/2}$, we obtain

$$\left|\sum_{(i,j)\in\bar{\Pi}} \left(\int_{s'}^{s} \left(e^{\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)}F(\tau), \eta_{ij}\right)_{\mathcal{C}} d\tau\right)\eta_{ij}\right| \le ce^{-\delta s'}e^{-\lambda^* s}|y|^{2\lambda^*-m+\gamma}.$$

Thus the proof is completed. □

Combining Lemma 7.8 - Lemma 7.9 and Lemma 7.1 - Lemma 7.3, we obtain the following result.

Proposition 7.2. *There exist $\delta > 0$ and $c > 0$ such that if $\varphi(y,s)$ satisfies (62), then it holds that*

$$\left|b(y,s) + e^{-\lambda^* s}\eta_{1\ell}(y)\right| \le ce^{-\delta s_1}e^{-\lambda^* s}\left(1+|y|^{2\lambda^*-m+\gamma}\right) \qquad \text{for } (y,s) \in O^{(\mathrm{II})}_{\mathrm{Long}}.$$

7.3 Long time III

Finally we provide the estimate in

$$O^{(\mathrm{III})}_{\mathrm{Long}} = \{\min\{e^{\sigma s}, e^{(s-s_1)/2}\} < |y| < e^{\sigma s},\ s_1+1 < s < s_2\}.$$

Without loss of generality, we can assume $e^{(s-s_1)/2} < e^{\sigma s}$. Furthermore throughout this subsection, we always assume $|d| < \epsilon_1 e^{-\lambda^* s_1}$, $\varphi(y,s) \in A_{s_1,s_2}$ and $(y,s) \in O^{(\mathrm{III})}_{\mathrm{Long}}$. Here we recall that $b(y,s)$ is given by

$$b(s) = e^{\mathcal{A}(s-s_1)}P_\ell b_1 - e^{-\lambda^* s}\eta_{1\ell} + \int_{s_1}^{s} e^{\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)}F(\tau)d\tau,$$

where $P_\ell b_1 = b_1 + e^{-\lambda^* s_1}\eta_{1\ell}$.

Lemma 7.10. *Let be $\nu(s)$ given in Lemma 5.4. Then there exist $\delta > 0$ and $c > 0$ such that*

$$\left|e^{\mathcal{A}(s-s_1)}P_\ell b_1\right| \le c\left(e^{-\delta s_1} + \nu(s_1) + e^{\lambda^* s_1}d_{\max}\right)e^{-\lambda^* s}\left(1+|y|^{2\lambda^+-m+\gamma}\right)$$

for $(y,s) \in O^{(\mathrm{III})}_{\mathrm{Long}}$.

Proof. We divide the integral into four parts.

$$e^{\mathcal{A}(s-s_1)}P_\ell b_1 = \left(\int_0^{He^{-\omega s_1}} + \int_{He^{-\omega s_1}}^{1} + \int_1^{e^{\varrho s_1}} + \int_{e^{\varrho s_1}}^{\infty}\right)\Gamma(y,\xi,s-s_1)P_\ell b_1 \mathcal{B}(\xi)d\xi. \tag{73}$$

Since $s > s_1 + 1$, Proposition 4.1 implies

$$\Gamma(y, \xi, s - s_1) \leq c e^{(\gamma - m)(s - s_1)/2} \left(|\xi| + 1\right)^{2\gamma} \exp\left(-c \left|e^{-(s-s_1)/2} y - \xi\right|^2\right). \tag{74}$$

Therefore we get from Lemma 5.4

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^{He^{-\omega s_1}} \Gamma(y, \xi, s - s_1) P_\ell b_1(\xi) \mathcal{B}(\xi) d\xi \\
&\qquad \leq c e^{(\gamma - m)(s-s_1)/2} \int_0^{He^{-\omega s_1}} \left(|\xi|^{-m+\gamma} + e^{-\lambda^* s}\right) |\xi|^{-2\gamma} d\xi \\
&\qquad \leq c e^{(\gamma - m)(s-s_1)/2} \left(\left(He^{-\omega s_1}\right)^{n-(\gamma+m)} + e^{-\lambda^* s_1} \left(He^{-\omega s_1}\right)^{n-2\gamma}\right) \\
&\qquad \leq c e^{(\gamma - m)(s-s_1)/2} \left(H^{n-(\gamma+m)} + H^{n-2\gamma}\right) e^{-(n-2\gamma)\omega s_1} e^{-\lambda^* s_1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $|y| > e^{(s-s_1)/2}$, we note that

$$e^{(\gamma-m)(s-s_1)/2} \cdot e^{\lambda^*(s-s_1)} \leq |y|^{\gamma - m + 2\lambda^*}. \tag{75}$$

Therefore we obtain from $\gamma > m$

$$\int_0^{He^{-\omega s_1}} \Gamma(y, \xi, s - s_1) P_\ell b_1(\xi) \mathcal{B}(\xi) d\xi \leq c H^{n-(\gamma+m)} e^{-(n-2\gamma)\omega s_1} e^{-\lambda^* s} |y|^{2\lambda^* - m + \gamma}.$$

Next we estimate the second integral in (73). By Lemma 5.4, we recall that

$$|P_\ell b_1| \leq c \left(\nu(s_1) e^{-\lambda^* s_1} + d_{\max}\right) \left(1 + |y|^{2\lambda^* - m + \gamma}\right) \qquad \text{for } He^{-\omega s_1} < |y| < e^{\varrho s_1}. \tag{76}$$

Plugging (74) and (76) into the second integral in (73), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{He^{-\omega s_1}}^{1} \Gamma(y, \xi, s - s_1) P_\ell b_1(\xi) \mathcal{B}(\xi) d\xi \\
&\qquad\qquad \leq c \left(\nu(s_1) e^{-\lambda^* s_1} + d_{\max}\right) e^{(\gamma-m)(s-s_1)/2} \int_{He^{-\omega s_1}}^{1} |\xi|^{-2\gamma} d\xi.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore since $\gamma < (n-2)/2$, by using (75), we obtain

$$\int_{He^{-\omega s_1}}^{1} \Gamma(y, \xi, s - s_1) P_\ell b_1(\xi) \mathcal{B}(\xi) d\xi \leq c \left(\nu(s_1) + d_{\max} e^{\lambda^* s_1}\right) e^{-\lambda^* s} |y|^{\gamma - m + 2\lambda^*}.$$

From (74) and (76), the third integral in (73) is estimated by

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_1^{e^{\varrho s_1}} \Gamma(y, \xi, s - s_1) P_\ell b_1(\xi) \mathcal{B}(\xi) d\xi &\leq c e^{(\gamma-m)(s-s_1)/2} \left(\nu(s_1) e^{-\lambda^* s_1} + d_{\max}\right) \\
&\quad \times \int_1^{e^{\varrho s_1}} |\xi|^{2\lambda^* - m + \gamma} \exp\left(-c \left|e^{-(s-s_1)/2} y - \xi\right|^2\right) d\xi.
\end{aligned}$$

We put

$$\begin{aligned}
D_1 &= \{1 < |\xi| < e^{\varrho s_1}; |e^{-(s-s_1)/2} y - \xi| < |\xi|/2\}, \\
D_2 &= \{1 < |\xi| < e^{\varrho s_1}; |e^{-(s-s_1)/2} y - \xi| > |\xi|/2\}.
\end{aligned}$$

For the case $\xi \in D_1$, we note that $|\xi| < 2e^{-(s-s_1)/2}|y|$. Hence we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{D_1} |\xi|^{2\lambda^*-m+\gamma} \exp\left(-c\left|e^{-(s-s_1)/2}y-\xi\right|^2\right) d\xi \\
&\qquad \le c\left(e^{-(s-s_1)/2}|y|\right)^{2\lambda^*-m+\gamma} \int_{D_1} \exp\left(-c\left|e^{-(s-s_1)/2}y-\xi\right|^2\right) d\xi \\
&\qquad \le ce^{-(2\lambda^*-m+\gamma)(s-s_1)/2}|y|^{2\lambda^*-m+\gamma}.
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore by definition of D_2, we get

$$\int_{D_2} |\xi|^{2\lambda^*-m+\gamma} \exp\left(-c\left|e^{-(s-s_1)/2}y-\xi\right|^2\right) d\xi \le \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} |\xi|^{2\lambda^*-m+\gamma} e^{-c|\xi|^2} d\xi \le c.$$

Therefore we obtain from (75)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_1^{e^{\varrho s_1}} \Gamma(y,\xi,s-s_1)P_\ell b_1(\xi)\mathcal{B}(\xi)d\xi \le ce^{(\gamma-m)(s-s_1)/2}\left(\nu(s_1)e^{-\lambda^* s_1}+d_{\max}\right) \\
&\qquad\qquad \times\left(\int_{D_1}+\int_{D_2}\right)|\xi|^{2\lambda^*-m+\gamma}\exp\left(-c\left|e^{-(s-1)/2}y-\xi\right|^2\right)d\xi \\
&\quad \le c\left(\nu(s_1)e^{-\lambda^* s_1}+d_{\max}\right)\left(e^{-\lambda^*(s-s_1)}|y|^{2\lambda^*-m+\gamma}+e^{(\gamma-m)(s-s_1)/2}\right) \\
&\quad \le c\left(\nu(s_1)+e^{\lambda^* s_1}d_{\max}\right)e^{-\lambda^* s}|y|^{2\lambda^*-m+\gamma}.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally we provide the estimate of the fourth term in (73). Here we note that

$$\begin{aligned}
e^{-(s-s_1)/2}|y| &= e^{-(s-s_1)/2}e^{\sigma s} = e^{(2\sigma-1)(s-s_1)/2}e^{\sigma s_1} \\
&= e^{(2\sigma-1)(s-s_1)/2}e^{-(\varrho-\sigma)s_1}e^{\varrho s_1} \qquad \text{for } |y|<e^{\sigma s}.
\end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, since $\sigma < 1/2$, it holds that for $|y| < e^{\sigma s}$ and $|\xi| > e^{\varrho s_1}$

$$|e^{-(s-s_1)/2}y-\xi| > c|\xi| > c|\xi| + ce^{\varrho s_1}.$$

Therefore we obtain from (74) and Lemma 5.4

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{e^{\varrho s_1}}^\infty \Gamma(y,\xi,s-s_1)P_\ell b_1(\xi)\mathcal{B}(\xi)d\xi &\le ce^{(\gamma-m)(s-s_1)/2}\exp\left(-ce^{2\varrho s_1}\right)\int_{e^{\varrho s_1}}^\infty |\xi|^{-m+\gamma}e^{-c|\xi|^2}d\xi \\
&\le ce^{(\gamma-m)(s-s_1)/2}\exp\left(-ce^{2\varrho s_1}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus it follows from (75) that

$$\int_{e^{\varrho s_1}}^\infty \Gamma(y,\xi,s-s_1)P_\ell b_1(\xi)\mathcal{B}(\xi)d\xi \le ce^{\lambda^* s_1}\exp\left(-ce^{2\varrho s_1}\right)e^{-\lambda^* s}|y|^{2\lambda^*-m+\gamma}.$$

Since $H = e^{a' s_1}$ with $0 < a' \ll 1$, combining the above estimates, we find that there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\left|e^{\mathcal{A}(s-s_1)}P_\ell b_1\right| \le c\left(e^{-\delta s_1}+\nu(s_1)+e^{\lambda^* s_1}d_{\max}\right)e^{-\lambda^* s}|y|^{2\lambda^*-m+\gamma}$$

for $(y,s) \in O^{(\mathrm{III})}_{\mathrm{Long}}$, which completes the proof. □

Next we provide the estimate of $\int_{s_1}^{s} e^{\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)}F(\tau)d\tau$. We divide this integral into two parts.

$$\int_{s_1}^{s-1} e^{\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)}F(\tau)d\tau = \left(\int_{s_1}^{s-1} + \int_{s-1}^{s}\right) e^{\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)}F(\tau)d\tau. \tag{77}$$

From Lemma 6.2, the second integral of (77) is estimated by

$$\left|\int_{s-1}^{s} e^{\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)}F(\tau)d\tau\right| \leq ce^{-\delta s_1}e^{-\lambda^* s}\left(1+|y|^{2\lambda^*-m+\gamma}\right). \tag{78}$$

Now we estimate the first integral of (77). Here we consider a more general from.

Lemma 7.11. *There exist $\delta > 0$ and $c > 0$ such that if $|y| \geq e^{(s-\mu_1)/2}$ and $s_1 \leq \mu_1 < s-1$, then it holds that*

$$\left|\int_{\mu_1}^{s-1} e^{\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)}F(\tau)d\tau\right| \leq ce^{-\delta s_1}e^{-\lambda^* s}\left(1+|y|^{2\lambda^*-m+\gamma}\right) \quad \text{for } (y,s) \in O_{\mathrm{Long}}^{(\mathrm{III})}.$$

Proof. First we divide the integral into four parts.

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mu_1}^{s-1} e^{\mathcal{B}(s-\tau)}F(\tau)d\tau &= \int_{\mu_1}^{s-1} d\tau \int_{\partial\mathbb{R}_+^n} \Gamma(y,\xi',s-\tau)F(\xi',\tau)\mathcal{B}(\xi')d\xi' \\
&= \int_{\mu_1}^{s-1} d\tau \left(\int_0^{He^{-\omega\tau}} + \int_{He^{-\omega\tau}}^{1} + \int_1^{e^{\sigma\tau}} + \int_{e^{\sigma\tau}}^{\infty}\right) \Gamma(y,\xi',s-\tau)F(\xi',\tau)\mathcal{B}(\xi')d\xi' \\
&=: I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + I_4.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $s-\tau > 1$ for $\tau \in (\mu_1, s-1)$, Proposition 4.1 implies

$$\Gamma(y,\xi,s-\tau) \leq ce^{(\gamma-m)(s-\tau)/2}(|\xi|+1)^{2\gamma}\exp\left(-c\left|e^{-(s-\tau)/2}y-\xi\right|^2\right)$$

for $\mu_1 < \tau < s-1$. Since $H < K$, we note from Lemma 5.7 that

$$|F(\xi',\tau)| = |f(\Phi(\xi',\tau))/\sigma(y)| \leq c\begin{cases} |y|^{-(m+1)+\gamma} & \text{for } |y| < He^{-\omega s}, \\ e^{-2\lambda^* s}|y|^{-1+m-\gamma} & \text{for } He^{-\omega s} < |y| < 1. \end{cases} \tag{79}$$

Hence this implies

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &\leq c\int_{\mu_1}^{s-1} e^{(\gamma-m)(s-\tau)/2}d\tau \int_0^{He^{-\omega\tau}} |\xi'|^{-m-1-\gamma}d\xi' \\
&= c\int_{\mu_1}^{s} e^{(\gamma-m)(s-\tau)/2}(He^{-\omega\tau})^{-m-\gamma+n-2}d\tau \\
&\leq cH^{n-2-(m+\gamma)}e^{-(n-2-2\gamma)\omega\mu_1}e^{(\gamma-m)(s-\mu_1)/2}e^{-\lambda^*\mu_1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here since $|y| > e^{(s-\mu_1)/2}$, we note that

$$e^{(\gamma-m)(s-\mu_1)/2} \cdot e^{\lambda^*(s-\mu_1)} \leq |y|^{\gamma-m+2\lambda^*}. \tag{80}$$

Therefore it follows that

$$I_1 \leq cH^{n-2-(m+\gamma)}e^{-(n-2-2\gamma)\omega\mu_1}e^{-\lambda^* s}|y|^{2\lambda^*-m+\gamma}.$$

Next we estimate I_2. Then from (79) and (80), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &\leq c\int_{\mu_1}^{s-1} e^{(\gamma-m)(s-\tau)/2}e^{-2\lambda^*\tau}d\tau \int_{He^{-\omega\tau}}^{1}|\xi'|^{m-1-3\gamma}d\xi' \\ &\leq c\int_{\mu_1}^{s} e^{(\gamma-m)(s-\tau)/2}e^{-2\lambda^*\tau}(He^{-\omega\tau})^{-(\gamma-m)}d\tau \int_{Le^{-\omega\tau}}^{1}|\xi'|^{-1-2\gamma}d\xi' \\ &\leq cH^{-(\gamma-m)}e^{(\gamma-m)(s-\mu_1)/2}e^{-\lambda^*\mu_1} \\ &\leq cH^{-(\gamma-m)}e^{-\lambda^* s}|y|^{2\lambda^*-m+\gamma}. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore we get from Lemma 5.7

$$I_3 \leq c\int_{\mu_1}^{s-1} e^{(\gamma-m)(s-\tau)/2}e^{-2\lambda^*\tau}d\tau \int_{1}^{e^{\sigma\tau}}|\xi'|^{-m-1+4\lambda^*+\gamma}\exp\left(-c\left|e^{-(s-\tau)/2}y-\xi'\right|^2\right)d\xi'.$$

Here we put

$$\begin{aligned} D_1 &= \left\{1<|\xi'|<e^{\sigma\tau}; |e^{-(s-\tau)/2}y-\xi'|<|\xi'|/2\right\}, \\ D_2 &= \left\{1<|\xi'|<e^{\sigma\tau}; |e^{-(s-\tau)/2}y-\xi'|>|\xi'|/2\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then since $e^{-(s-\tau)/2}|y|>|\xi'|/2$ for $\xi'\in D_1$, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{D_1}|\xi'|^{-m-1+4\lambda^*+\gamma}\exp\left(-c\left|e^{-(s-\tau)/2}y-\xi'\right|^2\right)d\xi' \\ &\qquad\leq c\left(e^{-(s-\tau)/2}|y|\right)^{4\lambda^*-m+\gamma}\int_{D_1}|\xi'|^{-1}\exp\left(-c\left|e^{-(s-\tau)/2}y-\xi'\right|^2\right)d\xi' \\ &\qquad\leq ce^{-(\gamma-m)(s-\tau)/2}e^{-2\lambda^*(s-\tau)}|y|^{4\lambda^*-m+\gamma}\int_{D_1}\exp\left(-c\left|e^{-(s-\tau)/2}y-\xi'\right|^2\right)d\xi' \\ &\qquad\leq ce^{-(\gamma-m)(s-\tau)/2}e^{-2\lambda^*(s-\tau)}|y|^{4\lambda^*-m+\gamma}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore since $|y|<e^{\sigma s}$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mu_1}^{s-1} e^{(\gamma-m)(s-\tau)/2}e^{-2\lambda^*\tau}d\tau\int_{D_1}|\xi'|^{-m-1+4\lambda^*+\gamma}\exp\left(-c\left|e^{-(s-\tau)/2}y-\xi'\right|^2\right)d\xi' \\ &\qquad\leq cse^{-2\lambda^* s}|y|^{4\lambda^*-m+\gamma}\leq cse^{-(1-2\sigma)\lambda^* s}e^{-\lambda^* s}|y|^{2\lambda^*-m+\gamma}. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore by definition of D_2, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{D_2}|\xi'|^{-m-1+4\lambda^*+\gamma}\exp\left(-c\left|e^{-(s-\tau)/2}y-\xi'\right|^2\right)d\xi' \\ &\qquad\leq\int_{D_2}|\xi'|^{-m-1+4\lambda^*+\gamma}e^{-c|\xi'|^2}d\xi'\leq c. \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, we obtain from (80)

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mu_1}^{s-1} e^{(\gamma-m)(s-\tau)/2}e^{-2\lambda^*\tau}d\tau\int_{D_2}|\xi'|^{-m-1+4\lambda^*+\gamma}\exp\left(-c\left|e^{-(s-\tau)/2}y-\xi'\right|^2\right)d\xi' \\ &\qquad\leq ce^{(\gamma-m)(s-\mu_1)/2}e^{-2\lambda^*\mu_1}\leq ce^{-\lambda^*\mu_1}e^{-\lambda^* s}|y|^{2\lambda^*-m+\gamma}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we conclude

$$I_3\leq c\left(se^{-(1-2\sigma)\lambda^* s}+e^{-\lambda^*\mu_1}\right)e^{-\lambda^* s}|y|^{2\lambda^*-m+\gamma}.$$

Finally from Lemma 5.7, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} I_4 &\leq \int_{\mu_1}^{s-1} e^{(\gamma-m)(s-\tau)/2} d\tau \int_{e^{\sigma\tau}}^{\infty} |\xi'|^{-m-1+\gamma} \exp\left(-c\left|e^{-(s-\tau)/2}y - \xi'\right|^2\right) d\xi' \\ &= \int_{\mu_1}^{s-1} e^{(\gamma-m)(s-\tau)/2} d\tau \left(\int_{D_1} + \int_{D_2}\right) |\xi'|^{-m-1+\gamma} \exp\left(-c\left|e^{-(s-\tau)/2}y - \xi'\right|^2\right) d\xi', \end{aligned}$$

where D_1 and D_2 are given by

$$\begin{aligned} D_1 &= \{|\xi'| > e^{\sigma\tau}; |e^{-(s-\tau)/2}y - \xi'| < |\xi'|/2\}, \\ D_2 &= \{|\xi'| > e^{\sigma\tau}; |e^{-(s-\tau)/2}y - \xi'| > |\xi'|/2\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $e^{-(s-\tau)/2}|y| > |\xi'|/2$ for $\xi' \in D_1$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{D_1} |\xi'|^{-m-1+\gamma} \exp\left(-c\left|e^{-(s-\tau)/2}y - \xi'\right|^2\right) d\xi' \\ &\quad\leq \left(e^{-(s-\tau)/2}|y|\right)^{2\lambda^*-m+\gamma} \int_{D_1} |\xi'|^{-2\lambda^*-1} \exp\left(-c\left|e^{-(s-\tau)/2}y - \xi'\right|^2\right) d\xi' \\ &\quad\leq ce^{-(\gamma-m)(s-\tau)/2} e^{-\lambda^*(s-\tau)} e^{-(2\lambda^*+1)\sigma\tau} |y|^{2\lambda^*-m+\gamma} \int_{D_1} \exp\left(-c\left|e^{-(s-\tau)/2}y - \xi'\right|^2\right) d\xi'. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore since $(2\lambda^* + 1)\sigma > \lambda^*$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mu_1}^{s-1} e^{(\gamma-m)(s-\tau)/2} d\tau \int_{D_1} |\xi'|^{-m-1+\gamma} \exp\left(-c\left|e^{-(s-\tau)/2}y - \xi'\right|^2\right) d\xi' \\ &\qquad\leq ce^{-\lambda^* s} \left(\int_{\mu_1}^{s-1} e^{(\lambda^*-(2\lambda^*+1)\sigma)\tau} \tau d\tau\right) |y|^{2\lambda^*-m+\gamma} \\ &\qquad\leq ce^{(\lambda^*-(2\lambda^*+1)\sigma)\mu_1} e^{-\lambda^* s} |y|^{2\lambda^*-m+\gamma}. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore by definition of D_2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{D_2} |\xi'|^{-m-1+\gamma} \exp\left(-c\left|e^{-(s-\tau)/2}y - \xi'\right|^2\right) d\xi' &\leq \int_{D_2} |\xi'|^{-m-1+\gamma} e^{-c|\xi'|^2} d\xi' \\ &\leq \int_{e^{\sigma\tau}}^{\infty} r^{-m+\gamma+n-3} e^{-cr^2} dr. \end{aligned}$$

Here we note that $r^{-m+\gamma+n-3}e^{-cr^2} < re^{-c'r^2}$ for $r > 1$. Therefore it holds that

$$\int_{D_2} |\xi'|^{-m-1+\gamma} \exp\left(-c\left|e^{-(s-\tau)/2}y - \xi'\right|^2\right) d\xi' \leq c \exp\left(-c' e^{2\sigma\tau}\right).$$

As a consequence, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mu_1}^{s-1} e^{(\gamma-m)(s-\tau)/2} d\tau \int_{D_2} |\xi'|^{-m-1+\gamma} \exp\left(-c\left|e^{-(s-\tau)/2}y - \xi'\right|^2\right) d\xi' \\ &\quad\leq c \int_{\mu_1}^{s} e^{(\gamma-m)(s-\tau)/2} \exp\left(-c' e^{2\sigma\tau}\right) d\tau \leq ce^{(\gamma-m)(s-\mu_1)/2} \exp\left(-c' e^{2\sigma\mu_1}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore (80) implies

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mu_1}^{s-1} e^{(\gamma-m)(s-\tau)/2} d\tau \int_{D_2} |\xi'|^{-m-1+\gamma} \exp\left(-c\left|e^{-(s-\tau)/2}y - \xi'\right|^2\right) d\xi' \\ &\qquad\leq ce^{\lambda^*\mu_1} \exp\left(-c' e^{2\sigma\mu_1}\right) e^{-\lambda^* s} |y|^{2\lambda^*-m+\gamma}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we conclude

$$I_4 \le c\left(e^{(\lambda^*-(2\lambda^*+1)\sigma)\mu_1} + e^{\lambda^*\mu_1}\exp\left(-c'e^{2\sigma\mu_1}\right)\right)e^{-\lambda^* s}|y|^{2\lambda^*-m+\gamma}.$$

Since $(2\lambda^*+1)\sigma > \lambda^*$, the proof is completed. ☐

Combining Lemma 7.10 - Lemma 7.11 and (78), we obtain the following result.

Proposition 7.3. *There exist $\delta > 0$ and $c > 0$ such that if $|d| < \epsilon_1 e^{-\lambda^* s_1}$ and $\varphi(y,s) \in A_{s_1,s_2}$, then it holds that*

$$\left|b(y,s) + e^{-\lambda^* s}\eta_{1\ell}(y)\right| < ce^{-\delta s_1}e^{-\lambda^* s}\left(1 + |y|^{2\lambda^*-m+\gamma}\right) \quad \text{for } (y,s) \in O_{\rm Long}^{\rm (III)}.$$

8 Exterior domain estimates

In this section, we provide the estimate in

$$O_{\rm Ext} = \{(y,s);\ r > e^{\sigma s},\ s_1 < s < s_2\}.$$

Here we define $m_0 > 1$ appearing in (46) as follows. Let c_H be the best constant given in Lemma 3.2. Then by definition of a JL-supercritical exponent, we recall that $U_\infty^{q-1}|_{\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+} < qU_\infty^{q-1}|_{\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+} < c_H$. Then we define $m_0 = m_0(q,n)$ by

$$m_0^{q-1} = c_H/U_\infty^{q-1}|_{\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+} > 1. \tag{81}$$

Furthermore let $e_H(\theta)$ be the first eigenfunction of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_S e = \lambda e & \text{in } (0,\pi/2), \\ \partial_\nu e = c_H e & \text{on } \theta = \pi/2. \end{cases}$$

Then it is known that the first eigenvalue is $-(n-2)^2/4$ (see Lemma 3.4). By using this fact, we see that $L(x) = e_H(\theta)r^{-(n-2)/2}$ gives a solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta L = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n_+, \\ \partial_\nu L = c_H r^{-1}L & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+. \end{cases}$$

Since $m < (n-2)/2$, we can choose $r_1 > 0$ such that

$$L(x) < \left(\frac{1+m_0}{2}\right)U_\infty(x) \quad \text{for } |x| > r_1. \tag{82}$$

Furthermore from $m_0 > 1$, we can fix $d_0 \in (0,1)$ such that

$$\left(\frac{1+m_0}{2}\right)U_\infty(x) + d_0 < \left(\frac{1+3m_0}{4}\right)U_\infty(x) \quad \text{for } |x| < r_1. \tag{83}$$

Now we divide $O_{\rm Ext}$ into two parts.

$$O_{\rm Ext}^{\rm (I)} = \left\{(y,s);\ e^{\sigma s} < r < r_1 e^{s/2},\ s_1 < s < s_2\right\},$$
$$O_{\rm Ext}^{\rm (II)} = \left\{(y,s);\ r > r_1 e^{s/2},\ s_1 < s < s_2\right\}.$$

It is clear that $O_{\rm Ext} = O_{\rm Ext}^{\rm (I)} \cup O_{\rm Ext}^{\rm (II)}$. First we provide the estimate in $O_{\rm Ext}^{\rm (I)}$.

Proposition 8.1. *There exists $s_0 > 0$ such that if $s_1 > s_0$, $|d| < \epsilon_1 e^{-\lambda^* s_1}$ and $\varphi(y,s) \in A_{s_1,s_2}$, then it holds that*

$$\varphi(y,s) \le \left(\frac{1+3m_0}{4}\right) U_\infty(y) \quad \text{for } (y,s) \in O^{(\mathrm{I})}_{\mathrm{Ext}}.$$

Proof. Throughout this proof, we assume $\varphi(y,s) \in A_{s_1,s_2}$. Here we put $T = e^{-s_1}$, $T' = e^{-s_1} - e^{-s_2}$ and

$$u(x,t) = (T-t)^{-m/2}\varphi((T-t)^{-1/2}x, -\log(T-t)).$$

Here we easily see that $0 < T' < T$ and $T' \to T$ as $s_2 \to \infty$. Then since $\varphi(y,s) \in A_{s_1,s_2}$, $u(x,t)$ is defined on $\mathbb{R}^n_+ \times (0,T')$ and satisfies (1) with $u_0(x) = T^{-m/2}\varphi(T^{-1/2}x, s_1)$. For simplicity, we put

$$\mathcal{O}_{T'} = \left\{(x,t);\ |x| > (T-t)^{(1-2\sigma)/2},\ 0 < t < T'\right\}.$$

Since $0 < \varphi(y,s) < m_0 U_\infty(y)$ for $|y| > e^{\sigma s}$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < u(x,t) &\le m_0 (T-t)^{-m/2} U_\infty\left((T-t)^{-1/2}x\right) \le c|x|^{-m} \\ &\le c(T-t)^{-(1-2\sigma)m/2} \quad \text{for } (x,t) \in \mathcal{O}_{T'}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore there exists $\kappa > 0$ such that the boundary condition on $\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+$ is given by

$$\partial_\nu u = u^q \le \kappa (T-t)^{-mq(1-2\sigma)/2} \quad \text{for } (x,t) \in \mathcal{O}_{T'}. \tag{84}$$

Furthermore since $|\varphi(y,s) - U_\infty(y)| \le ce^{-\lambda^* s}|y|^{2\lambda^*-m}$ for $|y| = e^{\sigma s}$, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} u(x,t) &\le (T-t)^{-m/2}\left(U_\infty\left((T-t)^{-1/2}x\right) + c(T-t)^{\lambda^*}\left((T-t)^{-1/2}|x|\right)^{2\lambda^*-m}\right) \\ &\le U_\infty(x) + c|x|^{2\lambda^*-m} \quad \text{for } |x| = (T-t)^{(1-2\sigma)/2},\ 0 < t < T'. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore since $m_0 > 1$, there exists $T_1 > 0$ such that if $T < T_1$, then it holds that $2c|x|^{2\lambda^*-m} < (m_0-1)U_\infty(x)$ on $|x| = (T-t)^{(1-2\sigma)/2}$ for $0 < t < T$. As a consequence, we get if $T < T_1$

$$u(x,t) < \left(\frac{1+m_0}{2}\right) U_\infty(x) \quad \text{for } |x| = (T-t)^{(1-2\sigma)/2},\ 0 < t < T'. \tag{85}$$

Since $\sigma < \varrho$, by definition of ϕ^*_ℓ, we easily see that

$$\varphi(y,s_1) \le \begin{cases} U_\infty(y) + \displaystyle\sum_{(i,j)\in\Pi} |d_{ij}||\phi_{ij}(y)| + e^{-\lambda^* s_1}|\phi_{1\ell}(y)| & \text{for } e^{\sigma s_1} < |y| < e^{\varrho s_1} + 1, \\ 0 & \text{for } |y| > e^{\varrho s_1} + 1. \end{cases}$$

Since $|d_{ij}| < \epsilon_1 e^{-\lambda^* s_1}$ and $|\phi_{ij}(y)| \le c_{ij}|y|^{2\lambda_{ij}-m}$ for $|y| > 1$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(y,s_1) &\le U_\infty(y) + ce^{-\lambda^* s_1}|y|^{2\lambda^*-m} \le U_\infty(y) + ce^{-(1-2\varrho)\lambda^* s_1}|y|^{-m} \\ &\le \left(1 + ce^{-(1-2\varrho)\lambda^* s_1}\right) U_\infty(y) \quad \text{for } e^{\sigma s_1} < |y| < e^{\varrho s_1} + 1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore by using $u_0(x) = T^{-m/2}\varphi(T^{-1/2}x, -\log T)$, we see that

$$u_0(x) \le \begin{cases} \left(1 + cT^{(1-2\varrho)\lambda^*}\right) U_\infty(x) & \text{for } T^{1/2-\sigma} < |x| < T^{1/2-\varrho} + T^{1/2}, \\ 0 & \text{for } |x| > T^{1/2-\varrho} + T^{1/2}. \end{cases} \tag{86}$$

As a consequence, there exists $T_2 > 0$ such that if $T < T_2$, then it holds that

$$u_0(x) \le \left(\frac{1+m_0}{2}\right) U_\infty(x) \quad \text{for } |x| > T^{(1-2\sigma)/2}. \tag{87}$$

Now we construct a super-solution. For simplicity, we put $p = mq(1-2\sigma)$. Let $g(x,t)$ be a solution of

$$\begin{cases} g_t = \Delta g, & (x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n_+ \times (0,T), \\ \partial_\nu g = \left(\dfrac{2\kappa}{d_0}\right)(T-t)^{-p/2} g, & (x,t) \in \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+ \times (0,T), \\ g(x,0) \equiv d_0/2, & x \in \mathbb{R}^n_+. \end{cases} \tag{88}$$

Here we put

$$\bar{u}(x,t) = \left(\frac{1+m_0}{2}\right) U_\infty(x) + g(x,t). \tag{89}$$

Then we easily check that $\bar{u}(x,t)$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \bar{u}_t = \Delta \bar{u}, & (x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n_+ \times (0,T), \\ \partial_\nu \bar{u} \ge \left(\dfrac{2\kappa}{d_0}\right)(T-t)^{-p/2} g, & (x,t) \in \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+ \times (0,T), \\ \bar{u}(x,0) \equiv \bar{u}_0(x) := \left(\dfrac{1+m_0}{2}\right) U_\infty(x) + d_0/2, & x \in \mathbb{R}^n_+. \end{cases}$$

Since $g(x,t) \ge d_0/2$ (see Lemma 8.1), we find

$$\partial_\nu \bar{u} \ge \kappa (T-t)^{-p/2} \quad \text{for } (x,t) \in \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+ \times (0,T). \tag{90}$$

We put $U(x,t) = \bar{u}(x,t) - u(x,t)$. Then from (84)-(87) and (89)-(90), we see that if $T < \min\{T_1, T_2\}$

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\nu U \ge 0 \quad & \text{for } (x,t) \in \mathcal{O}_{T'}, x \in \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+, \\ U > 0 \quad & \text{for } |x| = (T-t)^{(1-2\sigma)/2},\ 0 < t < T', \\ U > 0 \quad & \text{for } |x| > (T-t)^{(1-2\sigma)/2},\ t = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore applying a comparison lemma in $\mathcal{O}_{T'}$, we obtain if $T < \min\{T_1, T_2\}$

$$u(x,t) \le \bar{u}(x,t) \quad \text{for } (x,t) \in \mathcal{O}_{T'}.$$

Since $\sigma > 1/2q$, we easily see that $p < 1$. Therefore Lemma 8.1 implies $\sup_{(x,t)\in\mathbb{R}^n_+\times(0,T)} |g(x,t)| < d_0$ if $T < T_0$. Therefore if $T < \{T_0, T_1, T_2\}$, it holds that

$$u(x,t) \le \left(\frac{1+m_0}{2}\right) U_\infty(x) + d_0 \quad \text{for } (x,t) \in \mathcal{O}_{T'}.$$

As a consequence, by (83), if $T < \{T_0, T_1, T_2\}$, it follows that

$$u(x,t) \le \left(\frac{1+3m_0}{4}\right) U_\infty(x) \quad \text{for } (T-t)^{(1-2\sigma)/2} < |x| < r_1,\ 0 < t < T'.$$

Since $\varphi(y,s) = (T-t)^{m/2} u((T-t)^{1/2} y, t)$ with $T - t = e^{-s}$, we obtain the conclusion. □

Lemma 8.1. *Let $p < 1$ and $g(x,t)$ be a solution of* (88)*. Then there exists $T_0 > 0$ such that if $T < T_0$, then it holds that*

$$\sup_{(x,t)\in\mathbb{R}^n_+\times(0,T)} |g(x,t)| < d_0.$$

Furthermore it holds that $g(x,t) > d_0/2$ for $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n_+ \times (0,T)$.

Proof. Let $G_N(x,\xi,t)$ be the heat kernel on $\mathbb{R}^n_+$ with Neumann boundary condition. Then $g(x,t)$ is expressed by

$$g(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} G(x,\xi,t)\left(\frac{d_0}{2}\right) d\xi + \left(\frac{2\kappa}{d_0}\right)\int_0^t d\tau \int_{\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+} G_N(x,\xi',t-\tau)\frac{g(\xi',\tau)}{(T-\tau)^{p/2}} d\xi'.$$

Let $g_\infty(t) = \sup_{(x,\tau)\in\mathbb{R}^n_+\times(0,t)} |g(x,\tau)|$. Then since $p<1$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} g_\infty(t) &\le \frac{d_0}{2} + g_\infty(t)\left(\frac{2\kappa_0}{d_0}\right)\int_0^t (T-\tau)^{-p/2} d\tau \int_{\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+} G_N(x,\xi',t-\tau)d\xi' \\ &\le \frac{d_0}{2} + c g_\infty(t)\int_0^t (T-\tau)^{-(p+1)/2} d\tau \\ &\le \frac{d_0}{2} + cT^{(1-p)/2} g_\infty(t). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore since $p<1$, the first statement is proved. Furthermore since $g_1(x,t)\equiv d_0/2$ is a sub-solution, we obtain the second statement. ☐

Next we provide the estimate in $O^{(\mathrm{II})}_{\mathrm{Ext}}$.

Proposition 8.2. *There exists $s_0>0$ such that if $s_1>s_0$, $|d|<\epsilon_1 e^{-\lambda^* s_1}$ and $\varphi(y,s)\in A_{s_1,s_2}$, then it holds that*

$$\varphi(y,s) \le \left(\frac{1+m_0}{2}\right) U_\infty(y) \quad \text{for } (x,t)\in O^{(\mathrm{II})}_{\mathrm{Ext}}.$$

Proof. Throughout this proof, we assume $\varphi(y,s)\in A_{s_1,s_2}$. Let $u(x,t)$, T and T' be as in the proof of Proposition 8.1. From (86), there exists $T_1>0$ such that if $T<T_1$, then it hold that

$$u_0(x) \le L(x) \quad \text{for } x\in\mathbb{R}^n_+$$

Furthermore since $\varphi(y,s)\in A_{s_1 s_2}$, there exists $s_0>0$ such that if $s_1>s_0$, it holds that $\varphi(y,s)\le m_0 U_\infty(y)$ for $(y,s)\in\mathbb{R}^n_+\times(s_1,s_2)$. This implies

$$u(x,t)\le m_0 U_\infty(x) \quad \text{for } (x,t)\in\mathbb{R}^n_+\times(0,T').$$

Therefore the boundary condition on $\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+$ is given by

$$\partial_\nu u = u^q \le (m_0 U_\infty)^{q-1} u \le c_H r^{-1} u \quad \text{for } t\in(0,T').$$

Next we compare the values of $u(x,t)$ and $L(x)$ on $|x| = (T-t)^{(1+\omega)/2}$ for $0<t<T'$. Since $\varphi(y,s)\in A_{s_1 s_2}$, we recall that $u(x,t)<U_\infty(x)$ for $|x| = K(T-t)^{(1+\omega)/2}$ and $0<t<T'$. Furthermore we easily see that $L(x)>U_\infty(x)$ for $|x| = K(T-t)^{(1+\omega)/2}$ and $0<t<T$ if T is small enough. Therefore there exists $T_2>0$ such that if $T<T_2$

$$u(x,t) < L(x) \quad \text{for } |x| = K(T-t)^{(1+\omega)/2},\ 0<t<T'.$$

Thus applying a comparison lemma in $\mathcal{O}_{T'} = \{(x,t);\ |x|>K(T-t)^{(1+\omega)/2},\ 0<t<T'\}$, we obtain if $T<\min\{T_1,T_2,e^{-s_0}\}$

$$u(x,t) < L(x) \quad \text{for } (x,t)\in\mathcal{O}_{T'}.$$

Since $r_1 > K(T-t)^{(1+\omega)/2}$, we obtain from (82)

$$u(x,t) \le \left(\frac{1+m_0}{2}\right) U_\infty(x) \quad \text{for } |x|>r_1,$$

which completes the proof. ☐

A Appendix

In Appendix, we provide complete eigenfunctions and eigenvalues of

$$\begin{cases} -\Big(\Delta - \dfrac{y}{2}\cdot\nabla - \dfrac{m}{2}\Big)\phi = \lambda\phi & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n_+, \\ \partial_\nu \phi = \mathcal{K} r^{-1}\phi & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+. \end{cases} \tag{91}$$

Here we restrict ourselves to y_n-axial symmetric functions. We again introduce the following eigenvalue problem on the unit sphere introduced in (10).

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_S e = \kappa e & \text{in } (0,\pi/2), \\ \partial_\theta e = \mathcal{K} e & \text{on } \{\pi/2\}. \end{cases} \tag{92}$$

Let κ_i, $e_i(\theta)$ be the i-th eigenvalue, the i-th eigenfunction with $\|e_i\|_{L^2(S^{n-1}_+)} = 1$. Then we find that $L^2_S(S^{n-1}_+)$ is spanned by $\{e_i(\theta)\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$. Therefore any y_n-axial symmetric continuous function $f(y)$ is expressed by

$$f(y) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i(r) e_i(\theta).$$

Plugging this expression into (91), the eigenvalue problem is reduced to

$$-\Big(a'' + \frac{n-1}{r}a' - \frac{\kappa_i}{r^2}a' - \frac{r}{2}a' - \frac{m}{2}a\Big) = \lambda a, \qquad r > 0. \tag{93}$$

Let $a_{ij}(r)$ and λ_{ij} be the j-th eigenfunction with $\int_0^\infty a_{ij}(r)^2 e^{-r^2/4} r^{n-1} dr = 1$ and the j-th eigenvalue of (93). Therefore all eigenfunctions of (93) are expressed by

$$\phi_{ij}(y) = e_i(\theta) a_{ij}(r)$$

and its eigenvalue is given by λ_{ij}. Then the eigenvalue λ_{ij} is explicitly expressed in terms of κ_i. Here from Lemma 3.4, we recall that $\kappa_1 < 0$ and $\kappa_i > 0$ for $i \geq 2$.

Lemma A.1. *Let $a_{ij}(r)$ and λ_{ij} be the j-th eigenfunction and eigenvalue of* (93)*. Then it holds that*

$$a_{ij}(r) = \begin{cases} A_{1j} r^{-\gamma} M\Big(-(j-1), -\gamma + \dfrac{n}{2}, \dfrac{r^2}{4}\Big) & \text{if } i = 1, \\ A_{ij} r^{\gamma_i} M\Big(-(j-1), \gamma_i + \dfrac{n}{2}, \dfrac{r^2}{4}\Big) & \text{if } i \geq 2, \end{cases} \qquad \lambda_{ij} = \begin{cases} -\dfrac{\gamma}{2} + \dfrac{m}{2} + j - 1 & \text{if } i = 1, \\ \dfrac{\gamma_i}{2} + \dfrac{m}{2} + j - 1 & \text{if } i \geq 2, \end{cases}$$

where A_{ij} is a normalization constant, $\gamma \in (0, (n-2)/2)$ is a root of

$$\gamma^2 - (n-2)\gamma = \kappa_1 \qquad (\kappa_1 < 0)$$

and $\gamma_i > 0$ $(i \geq 2)$ is a root of

$$\gamma_i^2 + (n-2)\gamma_i = \kappa_i \qquad (\kappa_i > 0).$$

Furthermore the following asymptotic formula holds

$$a_{ij}(r) = \begin{cases} (c_{1j} + o(1)) r^{-\gamma} & \text{if } i = 1, \\ (c_{ij} + o(1)) r^{\gamma_i} & \text{if } i \geq 2, \end{cases} \qquad (r \sim 0)$$

$$a_{ij}(r) = \begin{cases} (\bar{c}_{1j} + o(1)) r^{2\lambda_{1j} - m} & \text{if } i = 1, \\ (\bar{c}_{ij} + o(1)) r^{2\lambda_{ij} - m} & \text{if } i \geq 2. \end{cases} \qquad (r \sim \infty)$$

Proof. By the same way as in the proof of Proposition 2.2 in [18] (see also p. p. 8 - 9 in [23]), we obtain the conclusion. ☐

Lemma A.2. *It holds that* $\lambda_{ij} \geq -(\gamma - m)/2$ *for any* $(i, j) \in \mathbb{N}^2$.

Proof. In Lemma A.1, we take $i = j = 1$. Then we easily see that $\lambda_{11} = -(\gamma - m)/2$. Since λ_{11} is the first eigenvalue, the proof is completed. ☐

References

[1] M. Chlebik, M. Fila, On the blow-up rate for the heat equation with a nonlinear boundary condition, Math. Methods Appl. Sci. **23** no. 15 (2000) 1323-2330.

[2] M. Chlebik, M. Fila, Some recent results on blow-up on the boundary for the heat equation, Evolution equations: existence, regularity and singularities, Banach Center Publ **52** (2000) 61-71.

[3] K. Deng, M. Fila, H. A. Levine, On critical exponents for a system of heat equations coupled in the boundary conditions, Acta Math. Univ. Comenian. **63** no. 2 (169-192).

[4] Dávila, J., Dupaigne, L., Montenegro, M. The extremal solution of a boundary reaction problem, Commun. Pure Appl. Anal. **7** (2008) 795-817.

[5] M. Fila, P. Quittner, The blowup rate for the heat equation with a nonlinear boundary condition, Math. Meth. in Appl. Sci. **14** (1991) 197-205.

[6] A. Grigor'yan, Heat kernel an Analysis on Manifolds, AMS/IP Studies in Advanced Mathematics, Vol. 47 (2009).

[7] A. Grigor'yan, L. Saloff-Coste, Stability results for Harnack inequalities, Ann. Inst. Fourier, Grenoble **55** 3 (2005) 825-890.

[8] Y. Giga, R. Kohn, Characterizing blowup using similarity variables, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **36** no.1 (1987) 1-40.

[9] Y. Giga, S. Matsui, S. Sasayama, Blow up rate for semilinear heat equations with subcritical nonlinearity, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **53** no. 2 (2004) 483-514.

[10] J. Harada, Single point blow-up solutions to the heat equation with nonlinear boundary conditions, to appear in Differential Equations & Applications.

[11] J. Harada, Blow-up behavior of solutions to the heat equation with nonlinear boundary conditions, preprint.

[12] J. Harada, Positive solutions to the Laplace equation with nonlinear boundary conditions on the half space, preprint.

[13] M. A. Herrero, J. J. L. Velázuquez, Explosion de solutions d'équations paraboliques semilinéaires supercritiques, C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I **319** (1994) 141-145.

[14] M. A. Herrero, J. J. L. Velázuquez, A blow up result for semilinear heat equations in the supercritical case, preprint

[15] K. Ishige, T. Kawakami, Global solutions of the heat equation with a nonlinear boundary condition, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **39** (2010) 429-457.

[16] N. G. Lloyd, Degree theory, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, No. 73. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge-New York-Melbourne (1978).

[17] N. Mizoguchi, Type-II blowup for a semilinear heat equation, Adv. Differential Equations **9** no. 11-12 (2004) 1279-1316.

[18] N. Mizoguchi, Blowup behavior of solutions for a semilinear heat equation with supercritical nonlinearity, J. Differential Equations **205** no. 2 (2004) 298-328.

[19] L. Moschini, A. Tesei, Parabolic Harnack inequality for the heat equation with inverse-square potential, Forum Math. **19** (2007) 407-427.

[20] P. Quittner, W. Reichel, Very weak solutions to elliptic equations with nonlinear Neumann boundary conditions, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **32** (2008) 429-452.

[21] P. Quittner, P. Souplet, Blow-up rate of solutions of parabolic poblems with nonlinear boundary conditions, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. S **5** no. 3 (2012) 671-681.

[22] L. Saloff-Coste, Aspects of Sobolev-Type Inequalities, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, 289. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2002).

[23] Y. Seki, On exact dead-core rates for a semilinear heat equation with strong absorption, UTMS **23** (2009) 1-46.